



Meeting Minutes - Final
Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, January 26, 2016

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

2 Roll Call

Present -- 7 - * Sanford Bond, * Matthew Elmes, * Bryan Green, * Joseph Yates, * Gerald Jason Hendricks, * James W. Klaus and * Andrew Ray McRoberts

Absent -- 2 - * Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor and * Nathan Hughes

3 Approval of Minutes

The November and December meeting minutes will be approved at the February 2016 meeting.

4 Other Business

Secretary's Report

Ms. Pitts stated that the Commission received a thank you note from Mrs. Carneal. Ms. Pitts stated Ms. Chen helped revise the language in the Guidelines for corner properties and stated that the members could look over it and see if there is some language that needs to be changed. Ms. Pitts stated that changes were made to reflect the discussion that occurred at the quarterly meeting regarding replacing the phrase "good pedestrian experience" with "compatible and materials consistent with neighboring properties."

Mr. Green stated that there are three sections which are proposed to be changed and stated that the second two are changes that are identical to the first; and he read aloud the changes.

Mr. McRoberts had concerns with the wording of adjacent neighboring properties and stated that he does not know if they are clarifying it to the extent that they would want to. Mr. Green inquired if they would be more comfortable if it said something that is consistent with properties on the block. Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks it would be better if it was a more broad interpretation allowing the applicant to stretch the norm by being able to choose or utilize some other elements within the district and stated that he is a fan of using the phrase "properties within the district" because that verbiage is used in the Guidelines.

Mr. Green stated that they will strike out the language neighboring properties to the language that are compatible with historic materials that is consistent with properties within the district.

A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts made a motion to adopt the language as amended.

Mr. Green stated that the three changes are clarification on intent height, width and massing residential, new standards for corner residential properties and new standards for corner commercial properties.

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

Ms. Pitts stated that at the quarterly meeting Mr. Green shared with them some applications and checklists that other states have used in the application process that would be useful to the Commission. Ms. Pitts stated that they will get a draft of a proposed application for the Commission to see how they can incorporate that into their application process.

Mr. Green stated that they were looking at Houston's intake system where they have a general application and then there is one specific application for new construction and one specific application for rehabilitation and repairs. Mr. Green stated that on the application there is a checklist of all the materials that the applicant must submit with it and stated that it may help them simplify with some of the project because they have been struggling with incomplete applications. Mr. Green stated that ultimately this is going to help speed up the staff review and have better consistency.

Administrative Approvals

Ms. Pitts distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued approvals for the period from December 16, 2015 through January 20, 2016.

Enforcement Report

Ms. Pitts stated that there will be several applications on the agenda from enforcement activity and stated that the corner store on Venable and Mosby that has unapproved and excessive signage was served a summons to the owner as staff never received a response back in terms of Notice of Violation.

The Commission discussed the amount of enforcements that are coming in.

Mr. Green inquired if they heard anything else about the disposition of the window appeal on Monument Avenue. Ms. Pitts stated that she hasn't heard anything from the City Attorney and that she is trying to follow up with him. Mr. Green inquired if the City Attorney could come to the next meeting and explain the details to the Commission, and Ms. Pitts stated that she would inquire about it.

Mr. Hendricks stated that a couple of months ago the Commission discussed getting an informational power point presentation to help spread the word about CAR and what they do to for contractors, homeowners and civic associations. Mr. Hendricks stated that it outlines the graphic organization of the booklet and stated that Mr. Green will look at it and modify the text.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they could update the contact information for the neighborhood associations and other professional groups. Ms. Pitts stated that she has the information of the all the neighborhood associations.

Ms. Pitts stated that the Commission received an email on the increased signage at the Lee Circle and stated that she has not heard back from the traffic engineer on the final plans for the signage.

Mr. Yates stated that the City put up a profusion of signs around the Lee Circle to coincide with the change of traffic pattern. Mr. Yates stated that thankfully most of the

signs have been removed and stated that there are still some signs that people are concerned about and stated that the Monument Avenue Preservation Society (MAPS) is going to try to address those with the City.

The Commission members briefly discussed the issue of the signage.

Other Committee Reports

There were no other committee reports.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Yates stated that at the request of the applicant that item number #18 for 1903 E. Marshall Street be moved to the consent agenda. Mr. Green stated that it might be good to hear the reason why they want it moved to the consent agenda.

Mr. Elmes stated that the assumption is that the only change in the plans is that they are trying to align the façade with the existing Cedar Street facades.

Ms. Pitts stated that there is also only minimum changes to the alley street elevation. Ms. Pitts stated that the Commission approved the project with the project being 15 inches from the Cedar Street elevation and stated that the project had to go before the BZA for a special exception.

Mr. Roy Benbow, Secretary of the Richmond Board of Zoning and Appeals, stated that this project was approved by the Commission with the currently proposed footprint and subsequently that the applicant asked that it be moved up to the street line and stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals approved that it could go up to the street line. Mr. Benbow stated that the BZA's decision was challenged in court. Mr. Benbow stated that there were two elements to the application one was the setback waiver to go up to the street line and the other was a height waiver and stated that there is no issue with the height waiver and stated that the court did not intercede with the height waiver but they did intercede with the setback waiver. Mr. Benbow stated that the applicant has come back to build it as it was originally approved.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates to move item #18 for 1903 E. Marshall Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and passed 6-1-0 (Green opposed).

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus to move item # 10 for 2301 Cedar Street from the regular to the consent agenda with staff conditions and recommendations. Mr. Yates stated that there was numerous references made about repointing brick and inquired if that was included in this or is it just the stained glass windows. Ms. Pitts stated that most of that work can be administratively approved as repair and maintenance work to the structures. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and passed 5-2-0(Hendricks and Elmes opposed).

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus to move item # 16 for 3008 E. Franklin Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts. Mr. Green inquired that the elevation drawings indicates that there is a detail on the cornice and stated that there is no detail on the cornice provided. Ms. Chen stated that there is no cut sheet but there is a description of the materials. After further discussion the motion passed 5-2-0(Green and Elmes opposed).

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus to move item # 17 for 3010 and 3012 E. Franklin Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bonds and passed 5-2-0(Green and Elmes opposed).

Ms. Pitts stated that application number #4 for 2510 Monument Avenue should also read as 2512 Monument Avenue as well.

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda with staff's recommendations. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 4 - Bond, Yates, Klaus and McRoberts

No -- 3 - Elmes, Green and Hendricks

- 1 [CAR No. 2016-002](#) 2115 M Street - Modify window locations and porch design on a previously approved addition

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

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

- 2 [CAR No. 2016-009](#) 802 N. 25th Street - Rehabilitate a single family home to include replacing windows and doors and enclosing a 2 story side porch

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

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

- 3 [CAR No. 2016-010](#) 810 N. 21st Street - Rehabilitate a single family home to include installing new windows and doors and constructing a 2 story side and rear porch

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

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

- 4 [CAR No. 2016-012](#) 2510 Monument Avenue - Replace railing system on four third-story balconies with a new Fypon railing system

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

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

- 10 [CAR No. 2016-016](#) 2301 Cedar Street - Restore stained glass windows in church sanctuary

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

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

- Aye --** 4 - Bond, Yates, Klaus and McRoberts
No -- 3 - Elmes, Green and Hendricks

- 16 [CAR No. 2016-018](#) 3008 E. Franklin Street - Construct a single family house

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

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

- Aye --** 4 - Bond, Yates, Klaus and McRoberts
No -- 3 - Elmes, Green and Hendricks

- 17 [CAR No. 2016-019](#) 3010-3012 E. Franklin Street - Construct two attached single-family houses

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

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

- Aye --** 4 - Bond, Yates, Klaus and McRoberts
No -- 3 - Elmes, Green and Hendricks

- 18 [CAR No. 2016-017](#) 1903 E. Marshall Street - Modify previously approved plans for a new multi-family dwelling to set the building back an additional 7.5 feet from Cedar Street

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 4 - Bond, Yates, Klaus and McRoberts

No -- 3 - Elmes, Green and Hendricks

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5 [CAR No. 2016-001](#) 723 N. 22nd Street - Demolish an existing garage and construct a new single story garage

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to demolish an existing single story garage and build a new single story garage in its footprint at the rear of a property located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. At the time of this application submittal, the demolition of the garage had occurred, and construction had begun on the new garage. On July 28, 2015, the Commission denied the applicant's request to construct a two story garage at the same location. Staff recommends approval of the project.

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

Mr. Charles Parham, the owner, came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that hte roof overhang be diminished so that it is minimal as possible and that the final materials and colors be approved by staff. Mr. Elmes made a friendly amendment that if lighting is required, it be deferred to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

- 6 [CAR No. 2016-003](#) 823 N. 24th Street - Parge and paint red the previously unpainted brick facade

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval

to parge portions of a brick wall and paint unpainted brick a bright red color on the side and rear elevations an Italianate mixed used building on a corner lot in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. This application is the result of an enforcement activity as the work was completed without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Commission. Staff recommends denial of the project.

Mr. Elmes inquired what there building permit number, and Ms. Pitts stated that there is no building permit associated with this property. Ms. Pitts showed some photos of the house.

Mr. Yates inquired if the parging and painting had been completed at the time of the Notice of Violation, and Ms. Pitts stated that with this property they were working with the Building Commissioner who issued the stop work order after the parging and painting had occurred.

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

Mr. Jay Murshed, the owner, stated that he hired a contractor to do the work and stated that the contractor stated that there were a lot of empty spots in the bricks and the best way to fix it was to put some cement on the spot. Mr. Murshed stated that he did not know that was not supposed to do that. Mr. Elmes inquired what the intended use of the structure, and Mr. Murshed stated that they will be apartments. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were aware that he has to get a building permit, and Mr. Murshed stated that the contractor said they did not need a permit for painting because that is all they did.

Mr. Green inquired if they did some repointing to the masonry before they painted, and Mr. Murshed stated no. Mr. Green stated that they mentioned that they were filling some holes with cement. Mr. Murshed stated that there were a lot of empty spots between the bricks. Mr. Green inquired if they did some repairs to the mortar, and Mr. Murshed stated yes.

Ms. Nancy Lambert, speaking as a member of the public, stated that she sent in a letter and stated that this is a contributing structure to Union Hill Old and Historic district and is opposed to the project.

Mr. Aaron Ogburn, speaking as a member of the public, stated that this is not a good look for the block and is opposed to the project.

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

Mr. Yates stated that the parging and painting of unpainted brick are not permitted by the CAR Guidelines.

Mr. Yates made a motion to deny this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond. Mr. Green stated that he wants to make sure that the motion includes that there is some repointing issues that will have to be dealt with. Mr. Yates added that he would like the applicant to work with staff to mitigate this. After further discussion, the vote carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

- 7 [CAR No. 2016-004](#) 815 N. 24th Street - Rehabilitate a single family home by replacing non-historic materials to include the siding, windows, and front porch stairs and relocating a rear door

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report for the applicant's request approval to rehabilitate a home in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff does not know the condition of the original wood siding beneath the vinyl. Staff recommends the applicant assess the condition of the original wood siding beneath the vinyl siding and that if possible, a sufficient amount of existing wood siding be salvaged and installed with the historic reveal on the front façade, and that smooth cementitious siding may be installed on the secondary elevations. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Aaron Ogburn, the owner, came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions and with the clarification that the windows will have a square heavy craftsman sill and a 5/4" casing, and that they will be 1-over-1, and that the remaining information can be confirmed by staff. Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that any new windows that are installed have the heads align with the existing windows. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

8 [CAR No. 2016-006](#) 725 N. 24th Street - Painting previously painted masonry blue

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to paint the brick piers and masonry foundation of the English basement of a Greek Revival home in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicant previously came before the Commission on November 24, 2015, as a result of enforcement activity as the elements of the front façade included the brick piers and foundation were painted a bright blue color without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff recommends denial of the project as submitted.

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

Mr. Chris Dosier, the owner, stated that he had a nice colonial brick patio installed around the back of the property and stated that painting all of that masonry red would look odd next to the brick walkway. Mr. Dosier stated that he does not want to do that and stated that he does not want to paint it back to the color brown that it was previously painted either. Mr. Dosier stated that he agrees to paint the wooden elements of the front facade a blue that was on the Commission's color palette and would like to paint the masonry the same color.

Mr. Dosier stated that the painting the masonry red will give the house a red, white and

blue color scheme and stated that he is very adamant about not painting it back to brown or the red brick color.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that the Commission as a body tries not to use words like weird or "it does not look right" because that is subjective; and as a body, they are not supposed to be an arbiter of taste and have guidelines that they are to follow. Mr. Elmes stated that their guidelines are typically what they follow with questions like this and stated that in regards to the rear area that is not visible from the public right of way that is not under their purview. Mr. Elmes stated that one of the most contentious issues in any old and historic district is color and stated that he understands the applicant's concerns and the reasons why he wants to do what he wants to do, but states therein lies the crux of living in an old and historic district.

Mr. Elmes stated that he does not think it will be a good idea for the Commission to put this back on staff and stated that his feelings when it comes to color are that the Guidelines are relatively clear on those particular elements.

Mr. Dosier stated that thought there is fence surrounding his rear yard, it would be obvious from the street if he painted the front one color and then the back another color. Mr. Dosier stated that he understands the Commission's points and stated that his problem is that he was given the option and when he bought the house it was a non-approved color and stated that it was painted brown on the masonry. Mr. Dosier stated that it strikes him as illogical that he can paint it back to brown which is not correct or historically accurate but states that he cannot change it to a color that he prefer. Mr. Dosier stated that he compromised by using one of the Commission's colors from the palette. Mr. Elmes stated that is understood and stated that those colors were applied pre-district and stated that they are allowed to make repairs to and or fix anything as it sits. Mr. Elmes stated that every month someone wants to change a paint color which he totally understands and stated that their Guidelines are pretty clear about the painting of masonry.

Mr. Green inquired what the applicant's concerns about using red were and inquired if he thought the red was going to clash. Mr. Dosier stated yes and that the colonial brick patio that goes all the way to the back and the brick foundations is pretty high and prominent and painting that a natural brick color is not going to look great. Mr. Green stated that he had the same issue in his house and he found a dull brick color that blended well and stated that there are some red colors that are not going to be electric.

Mr. Klaus stated that there are several different brick colors and browns and stated that hopefully one of those colors would match the applicant's color scheme.

Mr. William Bulifant, speaking as a member of the public, stated that if the applicant should go with a matte finish which will not reflect a lot of light and not a high gloss paint.

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

The Commission had a brief discussion about deferral, denial or approval.

Ms. Pitts stated that the applicant has a previously approved application with the conditions that the all the masonry be painted an approved red brick color to be reviewed and approved administratively by staff and that the applicant work with staff for a usable blue color from the palette for the wooden elements of the front façade.

Mr. Klaus made a motion to deny this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. It was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

- 9 [CAR No. 2016-007](#) 2705 E. Clay Street - Paint an existing single family home and install vinyl siding at the rear

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to paint an existing vernacular Italianate dwelling and apply vinyl siding to the addition at the rear of this home in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The application is a result of enforcement activity as the property was cited for painting, construction of a rear addition and other exterior work without review and approval by the Commission of Architectural Review. Staff recommends partial approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green inquired if they were discussing the vinyl but not the presence of the second story is not a part of the application. Ms. Pitts stated that when the applicant spoke with staff they informed them the condition was that there was a second story addition always present on the rear. Ms. Pitts stated that the applicant just applied for the cladding of the vinyl on the rear of the structure. Ms. Pitts stated that when staff was preparing the staff report, staff determined that there was no building permit or CAR approval for the new addition.

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

Mr. William Bulifant stated that he bought this house to personally move into and stated that he knew he had to keep wooden elements but states that he did not know he had to keep colors. Mr. Bulifant stated that the colors he choose came from the Benjamin Moore color palette and stated that on the rear he was told that if it is not visible from the street then he could use vinyl. Mr. Bulifant inquired if he could use vinyl in the back to make it look cleaner for his own preference.

Mr. Green stated that the Commissions colors comes from the color palette in the Commission's Design Guidelines and stated that some of it may overlap with some of the commercial palettes but they are not going to be identical. Mr. Green stated that many of them are changing their colors and introducing different colors and stated that the Commission holds to the spirit of the colors on their palette.

Mr. Bulifant stated that he has never been in a historic district and stated that this is all new to him and he would appreciate them coaching him through. Mr. Green stated that there are some overlapping with the colors because many of the commercial places change their historic color palettes every year.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that if you have a house in an old and historic district and stated Richmond Virginia has a set number of colors in their color palette and stated that Benjamin Moore color palettes could be based on the entire country and that is where working with the Commission staff comes in.

Ms. Pitts stated that there is an alley that is near the property but states that it is not

accessible and stated that you would have to go through private property to access it. She stated that the addition is visible from 27th Street. Ms. Pitts stated that she has photos from 2009 showing there was no second story structure.

Mr. Green made a motion to defer this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the applicant to work with staff on paint colors and more details on the second story addition on the rear of the structure. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

- 11 [CAR No. 2016-008](#) 511-511 1/2 N. 26th Street - Modify previously approved plans including the relocation of windows and doors and the inclusion of a new door and stairs on a side elevation

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request approval to modify previously approved plans for the construction of a 4-unit multi-family structure on two vacant lots in the Church Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends evenly spaced spacing two columns at the rear to ensure no opening is located directly behind a column. Staff also recommends the proposed landing and railing from the backflow overflow preventer which will be visible from the front of the structure should be painted or stained a color to be administratively reviewed and approved by staff. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Jimmy Freeman, representing the owner, came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions in the staff report. Mr. McRoberts asked if they were required to change to foundation posts and Mr. Green stated, yes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

- 12 [CAR No. 2016-011](#) 322 N. 36th Street - Construct a single family home

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's requests approval to construct a single-family house on a vacant lot in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. The applicant came before the Commission on June 23, 2015, and received approval for the construction of the similar 2-story single family structure. The Commission recommended approval of the project with multiple conditions. For this reason, staff recommends:

- The first floor windows and doors align vertically with the second floor openings
- All proposed windows are to be the same width
- Simple six-panel doors or other doors of a more appropriate style than proposed be submitted for review and administrative approval by staff
- The parge coat be opaque, and the coursing beneath must not telegraph through the parge coat
- The rear porch structure be painted or opaquely stained in a color to be reviewed and administratively approved by staff
- The fiber cement siding have a smooth finish with no faux wood grain or beading.

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

Mr. Reiuikobas, contractor, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Rick Carson, speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak for the project.

Mr. Green stated that they received a letter of support.

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

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application with staff's recommended conditions as presented and with the condition that the applicant look into terracing the front and allow the vertical aligning of the second floor windows as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. McRoberts and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 6 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks and McRoberts

No -- 1 - Klaus

13 [CAR No. 2016-013](#) 2317 Carrington Street - Construct a single family house

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct a new single family dwelling. The application was reviewed conceptually at the December 15, 2015 meeting. The Commission was generally favorable in its comments, but there was some concern expressed about the scale and details of the façade especially related to the proportions of the front gable. There have been some modifications that have been made to the design since the conceptual review. Staff recommends approval of the project be conditioned on colors for the doors and fencing be submitted to staff for administrative approval.

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

Mr. Dave Seibert, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Elaine Odell, speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak for the project.

Mr. Green stated that there are 2 letters of support for the project.

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

discussion began.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

- 14 [CAR No. 2016-014](#) 1902-1908 Princess Anne Avenue - Modify previously approved plans to remove one single family home from the proposed four attached single-family houses

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to modify previously approved plans. The applicant is seeking a modification to the project as a result if parking requirements imposed by zoning. No other modifications have been made to the design as approved by the Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff recommends approval of the project.

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

Mr. Richard Cross, the owner came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the followign vote.

Aye -- 4 - Bond, Elmes, Hendricks and Klaus

No -- 3 - Green, Yates and McRoberts

- 15 [CAR No. 2016-015](#) 2308 Jefferson Avenue - Construct a new mixed use building

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct a new mixed use building. The application was reviewed conceptually at the December 15, 2015 meeting. The Commission was generally favorable in its comments, but there was some discussion related to the verticality of the ground floor and the horizontal nature of the upper floors, the departure from the traditional three-bay pattern of the upper stories, and an understanding of the details especially at the corners. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions. The proposed infill project appears generally to be in keeping with the Standards for New Construction outlined in the Guidelines. Staff recommends that approval be conditioned that the ground floor be symmetrically organized and unified by the use of vertical and horizontal framing elements; the second story windows be symmetrically placed in the façade; a

survey be submitted that shows the placement of the building on the lot and that colors for the doors and windows be submitted for staff approval if they are a color other than white.

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

Ms. Sarah Krumbein and Ms. Mary Krumbein, the owners, came up to answer questions. Ms. Sarah Krumbein stated that they did the conceptual review in December and the Commission requested additional about the cornice detail and she would like guidance on which one that the Commission prefers and recommends. Ms. S. Krumbein stated that they are amenable to the staff's recommendations about the symmetry on the first through the third floor and more details on the sides. Ms. S. Krumbein stated that they spoke to the community and one of the things that came out of it was they wanted to make sure that the trash room door is opaque which they will also include.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they have to sprinkle this and Ms. S. Krumbein stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired where the sprinkler head and bases are going and Ms. S. Krumbein stated that she spoke with Ms. Pitts about it and stated that she will bring that information back once they have talked with the fire department and stated that they do not have an engineer drawing for that yet. Mr. Elmes stated that he is mystified about where the meters are going without ending up on the front. Mr. Elmes inquired if they had any strong feelings about what staff has suggested as far as getting the front more vertically unified, and Ms. S. Krumbein stated that she was not quite clear what they meant by vertically unified and stated that she was okay about the comments that came about at the last review about the symmetry. Mr. Elmes stated that one side being narrow than the other. Ms. S. Krumbein stated that it is on an extreme angle which is part of the issue with the lot and stated that there is an 18ft setback on that side. Mr. Elmes stated that when you sit there and stare at this, and you stare at the lot there is no way it is fitting there. Ms. S. Krumbein stated that it is difficult to render. Mr. Elmes stated that he understands to a degree perspective that they are not going to have that head on because it is slightly rounding the corner and stated that this looks a lot like what they saw in December. Ms. S. Krumbein stated yes and stated that there are several options for the cornice details.

Mr. Green stated that the cornice detail does not look like the cornice details in the rendering and stated that it looks like the break out detail falls back and recedes at the top and on the rendering it projects. Ms. S. Krumbein stated that if you look at A-200 1-A on the cornice profile one of the recommendations that was requested was that it be an equal 3 inches and stated that there are 3 inches on top of the recessed panel in the middle. Ms. S. Krumbein stated that they have enlarged it to 5 on the top and 3 on the bottom. Mr. Green stated that what is happening at the top is the re-entered angle rejecting back out again and stated that the way it is drawn it looks like it falls back and Ms. S. Krumbein stated that the two pieces that protrude are on the same plane and then there is a recessed panel. Mr. Green stated that there is another element on the top that they did not draw on page A-200 1-A cornice profile. Ms. Krumbein stated that there is a slight 1 inch protrusion on the bottom.

Mr. Yates stated that he agrees with staff's comments.

Mr. Bond inquired if there any kind of proposed commercial use and Ms. Krumbein stated that it is a way box at the moment.

Ms. Stacy Moulds, representing Tricycle Garden, speaking as a member of the public, came up to express their concerns about how it will visually affect the neighborhood.

Ms. Ryland Potter, member of the Tricycle Garden, speaking as member of the public, came up to express her concerns about how this project will affect the Tricycle Garden.

Ms. Elaine Odell, speaking as a member of the Union Hill Civic Association, Adjacent Homeowner and a member of the Tricycle Garden, came up and expressed her concerns regarding this project and asked the Commission to stick to their guns about the concerns.

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

Mr. Green stated that some of the questions that were asked were about the mass and scale in terms of lot coverage, the disposition of the east elevation, the conversation with the Union Hill Neighborhood Associations and the adjacent Tricycle Gardens. Mr. Green stated also a sense of how the building relates to the building next door and the disposition of the fenestration are of concern.

Mr. Klaus stated that he does have some concerns about a lot of the issues raised by the community and staff.

Mr. Green summarized the main concerns that were not covered were the connections to the two buildings, the locations of the meters, the first floor to read more like a storefront to be able to tie the two buildings together, the two sets of paired windows as opposed to a different configuration by using a 3 set arrangement like the neighboring building, where the fire equipment was going and the disposition of the east elevation. Mr. Green stated another question that was unanswered was how the buildings tie together so that it reads more like a storefront and the window alignment.

Mr. Yates stated that there were issues raised about zoning which are clearly zoning issues and stated that the Commission cannot discuss zoning issues. Ms. Pitts stated that the applicant and staff discussed this with zoning, and zoning had no issues. Ms. Chen stated that the only issue zoning raised is there is a requirement for off street parking and stated that because there is no rear access that will be addressed at a later time and stated that they will not require parking.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness in order for the applicant to address the issues that staff has raised and to speak with the neighborhood about the project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

No -- 1 - Elmes

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 19 [CAR No. 2016-005](#) 2400 E. Franklin Street - Construct a single family dwelling

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request conceptual review of the siting of a free standing single family dwelling to be constructed in a vacant lot in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District that offers a variety of

challenges. The parcel consists of a hill that rises from Franklin Street on the south to an alley behind Grace Street on the north. The parcel consists of a hill that rises from Franklin Street on the south to an alley behind Grace Street on the north.

Mr. Elmes stated that it can face the 24th Street and inquired if it's a non-hardship issue because that is the closest street to it. Ms. Chen stated that based on the Guidelines, it has to front one of the primary streets adjacent to the property and stated that they are saying that it is hardship to face Franklin Street which is the street to which it is addressed because of the slope. Ms. Chen stated that because it is more level at the upper portion of the lot it might be possible to front the house on 24th Street to meet the Guidelines. Mr. Elmes stated that there is no hardship reasoning for them not to face 24th Street, and Ms. Chen stated not that she is aware of.

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

Mr. Robbie Johnson, representing the owners David Kapella and Annie Dowdy, stated that staff's summary was very thorough. Mr. Johnson stated that there were a couple of additional items that they might bring to the Commission at this time and stated that one of them would be the zoning hardship, context, and location. Mr. Johnson stated that with the zoning specifically it is M1 and which does not allow single family residential and stated that they are seeking R6. Mr. Johnson stated that the setbacks which would be on 25th Street would be consistent with houses on the corner of 24th and Grace. Mr. Johnson stated that the R6 will require them to use alley that they have access to as a rear entry point. Mr. Johnson stated that regarding the hardship that staff has discussed the grade on the front of the property they are changing elevations 30ft over the first 50ft of the site.

Mr. Green inquired if it was 30ft from the street level up and Mr. Johnson stated to the platform and stated that if you continue to go up there where they are suggesting that the house be located they will closer to an 80ft range and climb an additional 6 to 8ft. Mr. Johnson stated that they are approaching the Commission at this time in the interest of their clients resources both time and money to have a conversation about an alternative siting before they really get into schematic design. Mr. Johnson stated that the other hardship that they are looking at is that there is currently no sewer or gas access along E. Franklin Street but states that the site does have a unique access point to 25th Street where they would be able to access utilities versus extensive expense to bring those in across E. Franklin. Mr. Johnson stated that there is an existing easement for the adjacent property that provides 4 parking spaces. Mr. Johnson stated that if they would follow the edge of the embankment to the back edge of the parking is on their property. Mr. Johnson stated that with the context and location, they do feel that the siting of the building at the top of this hill actually takes advantages of some of the things that makes St. John's Old and Historic District unique and stated that as the Guidelines states their impressive use of downtown Richmond and the James River. Mr. Johnson stated that clearly the higher they climb on the site while respecting the building height requirements and stated that they have the opportunities to pick up on some of those views that make this such a distinctive neighborhood. Mr. Johnson stated that additionally the Guidelines describes St. John's as a having large areas of public open space and stated that they think that along the street front on East Franklin you would encounter a city property with the stairs, the school property and then you would encounter a public park that is currently open green space. Mr. Johnson stated the owner is willing to look at the hillside and clean it up. Mr. Johnson stated that the last thing is acknowledging the adjacency they are seeking to the resident scale that they find north of the property versus the commercial scale to the south of the property.

Mr. Green inquired was anything ever built on this site before. Ms. Chen stated that she did not know but will look into it. Mr. Green stated that it is an interesting site and

inquired how they felt about staff's thinking about 24th Street as the front. Mr. Johnson stated that he wants to see how pedestrians interface with the house and how it addresses the street front and stated that some of the schematics suggests that it will front 24th Street which the owners are open to. Mr. Johnson stated that one thing they want to be careful about is the further you move southeast away from that edge you moving into a pretty significant bold typography of this site which would be a pretty significant hardship. Mr. Green stated that the thing that struck him when about the site is that it's almost like a pavilion a building that really does not have a traditional front or back a building but with multiple fronts. Mr. Johnson stated that in his architecture practice he treats all buildings as having at least four entrances unless they are on a triangular lot and stated that they would be sensitive to every elevation and there is a desire to be clever with design to create some exterior space. Mr. Johnson stated that there is further discussion about how the building connects with site and the street.

Mr. Bond stated that it is an outstanding opportunity for them to do an incredible building in this environment and stated that it could be a fine contemporary building given the location and the nature of the lot. Mr. Bond stated that it really demands some real study and hopes that the next time they see them with a design model. Mr. Johnson stated that they would be happy to bring a model and stated that they have full potential to do something respectful and studying the neighborhood in a larger context and study some of the density patterns.

Mr. McRoberts stated that they see a lot of infill development in the areas where there are apartments that are in-filled and inquired that is not what the owners want to do. Mr. Johnson stated correct and stated that they purchased the property with the understanding that it was not zoned for a single family residential and stated that understanding what challenges might lie ahead of them with the rezoning application which has already been submitted and is waiting to hear feedback from staff. Mr. McRoberts stated that it is an amazing location and an interesting historic context and stated that as far as putting it on the top of the hill it is the obvious choice. Mr. McRoberts stated that if they front it 24th Street they would avoid some of that need for hardship and stated that given the setback because the hill of the school and the park on the other side, it is quite an amazing avenue to front a house looking that way. Mr. McRoberts stated that he commends them for coming in and talking to the Commission at an early stage and stated that he thinks the idea of having a brand new single family home on top of the hill is an amazing opportunity.

Mr. Green stated that this really a unique site and stated that some of the Commission concerns are that the Commission wants them to make sure that they have an entrance that is addresses 24th Street and addresses south to the extent where they can see it.

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

Mr. Jeff Williamson, residents in the St. John's Old and Historic District speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak about the project.

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

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.

Adjournment

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 7:06 p.m.

