



City of Richmond

City Hall
900 East Broad Street

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, November 22, 2016

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

2 Roll Call

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

Absent -- 2 - * Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor and * Commissioner David C. Cooley

3 Approval of Minutes

August 23, 2016

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus, seconded by Mr. Bond, that the August minutes be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

September 27, 2016

The September minutes will be approved at the next CAR meeting.

October 25, 2016

The October minutes will be approved at the next CAR meeting.

4 Other Business

Secretary's Report

Ms. Pitts and the Commission members briefly discussed the 2017 schedule for the CAR meetings. Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve the new revised 2017 schedule, seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed.

Ms. Pitts stated that staff are working to ensure that they have a Planner I on board and stated that the top candidate has accepted the position with a tentative start date of December 12th. Ms. Pitts stated that the position will be helping out mostly with enforcement since this has suffered the most.

Administrative Approvals

Administrative Approvals

There are no administrative reports

Enforcement Report

Ms. Pitts stated that 2407 Cedar Street is the home with the graffiti on the exterior. She stated that staff have been following up on enforcement and have issued a Notice of Violation. Staff spoke with the property owner and the property owner's son, who is essentially the tenant of the building, who did the graffiti. Ms. Pitts stated that the son was going to come back with an application to replace all of the vinyl siding with HardiePlank siding. Ms. Pitts stated that staff told the applicants that they still needed to abate the violation. Ms. Pitts stated that an application was not submitted in time to be on the November agenda. She also stated that the applicant was allowed a few extra days and an application was still not submitted so staff is proceeding with a Notice of Pending Prosecution and court activity. Ms. Pitts stated that the landlord and the father understand the situation and they are trying to encourage the son to resolve the matter.

Other Committee Reports

National Register Nominations

Ms. Chen read the National Register Nomination for the Higgins Doctors Office at 3540 Floyd Avenue, built in 1954. Ms. Chen stated that the building is being considered eligible under Criterion C for architectural design at the local level with a period of significance of 1954. She stated that staff recommends that the Commission support the nomination at the local level. Ms. Chen stated that the second property is a single family dwelling also in the modernist style called Rock Falls. The dwelling is located on the south side of the James River adjacent to a former quarry on a 6 acre parcel. Ms. Chen stated that it was built in 1937 and it is being considered at the local level under Criterion C with a period of significance of 1936 and 1937. She stated that staff is recommending that the Commission support the nomination which will make tax credits available and hopefully lead to the preservation of the building.

Mr. Bond made a motion to support the nominations for the National Register, seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 7-0-0.

UDC Report

Mr. Green stated that at the UDC meeting they reviewed two projects for encroachments, one was on Westhampton and Grove which was the redevelopment of the West Hampton Theater where they are reworking the streetscape encroachments which was approved. The second project was in Scotts Addition at 1114 North Boulevard where they are reworking the sidewalk encroachments for an ATM machine for ADA accessibility which was also approved. Mr. Green stated that a great deal of grant money came to the City to do some streetscape improvements in tandem with the Pulse Transit System.

The Commission briefly discussed the quarterly meeting on January 10th at the Commonwealth building at 6pm.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Hughes, seconded by McRoberts, that the consent agenda be approved with staff's conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- 1 [CAR No. 2016-169](#) 22 E. Broad Street - Rehabilitate the structure to include a new storefront.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Mr. McRoberts, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the details of the signage and colors be submitted for administrative review and approval; the second floor windows on façade be restored to match the existing 1/1 configuration; the work be performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions; and any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 2 [CAR No. 2016-144](#) 2423 E. Grace St. - Remove eastern handrail on 1st story of the rear porch and install lattice to the height of 5'-10".

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda

- 3 [CAR No. 2016-158](#) 2220-2222 Jefferson Avenue - Rehabilitate a multi-unit building to include the installation of fiber cement siding, replacement of all windows, enclosure of rear porches, and construction of new decks.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Hendricks, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the siding on the first floor of the façade be retained and if possible, a sufficient amount of existing wood siding from other elevations be salvaged and installed with the historic reveals on the 2nd story of the façade; the fiber cement siding installed be smooth, unbeaded, and installed with a reveal consistent with the historic reveal; the 1st floor windows on the façade be retained; the replacement windows be 2/2, true or simulated divided lite, aluminum clad wood windows; the proposed PVC clad windows not be installed; the proportions of the porch enclosure be modified as to better relate to the existing porch railing to open space proportions and the siding area surrounding the windows be minimized by increasing the window size; the installation of windows, transoms, and vertical siding for the porch enclosure be extended to encompass the footprint of the existing porches; details of the rear door and paint colors be provided for administrative review and approval; and the deck be painted or opaquely stained a color to be administratively reviewed and approved; and the sub-decking be screened with lattice to be painted or opaquely stained a color to be reviewed by

staff or the proposed wooden piers be replaced with brick piers. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- 4 [CAR No. 2016-159](#) 504 N. 29th Street - Rehabilitate an existing structure to include the installation of fiber cement siding, replacement of all windows with vinyl windows, reconstruction of the side porches to include screening the upper porch, the restoration of the historic openings on the first floor of the façade, and construction of a new deck.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: The Commission denied the replacement of the original windows at this time and recommends a full window survey be provided; the Commission approved the installation of the new front door; the replacement of the non-historic window on the first floor of the façade with the condition that the two replacement windows be 1/1 wood or aluminum clad wood windows with ogee lugs to match the configuration of the historic windows on the second story; the replacement of the siding with the condition that the wood Dutch Lap siding be assessed in coordination with CAR staff and if possible, a sufficient amount of existing wood siding be salvaged and installed with the historic reveals on the façade; the fiber cement siding on the secondary elevations be installed with a reveal consistent with the historic reveal, have a Dutch Lap profile, be smooth, and be unbeaded, and paint colors be provided to staff for administrative review and approval; the rebuilding of the porches including the screening of the 2nd story with the condition the porch structure remain the same size which would require the roof of the single story projection to remain as is; and the construction of the deck with the condition the deck be painted or opaquely stained a color to be administratively reviewed and approved and details of the proposed railing material be provided to staff for administrative review. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- 5 [CAR No. 2016-160](#) 804 N. 22nd Street - Install fiber cement siding on an existing concrete block apartment building and replace existing windows with vinyl slider windows.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the siding be painted a dark color to be reviewed and administratively approved by staff to minimize the appearance of the grain; two double hung windows or two casement windows be installed rather than the proposed slider; the porch railing be a standard

Richmond rail design that is more compatible with the district, or the proposed pickets be placed on the inside of the handrail for a more finished appearance; and the porches be painted or opaquely stained a color to be administratively reviewed and approved by staff. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No -- 1 - Green

- 6 [CAR No. 2016-161](#) 2712 Monument Avenue - Replace existing porch columns with new fiberglass columns to math the existing design.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the applicant provide evidence that the columns and capitals have deteriorated beyond repair; and the capitals be retained if possible and if not, the replacement capitals match the existing as much as feasible. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No -- 1 - Green

- 7 [CAR No. 2016-162](#) 2209 Venable Street - Rehabilitate the existing structure and replace an existing 2nd story addition with a new 2 story addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the work be performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit Application approval and conditions and any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recused -- 1 - Green

- 8 [CAR No. 2016-163](#) 808 N. 21st Street - Construct a multifamily structure on a vacant lot.

Attachments: [Application and Plans - 3/28/17](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Application and Plans - 12/13/16](#)

[Staff Report 12/13/16](#)

[Application and Plans - 11/22/16](#)

[Staff Report - 11/22/16](#)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda

- 9 [CAR No. 2016-165](#) 2504 W. Grace Street - Replace all windows with vinyl windows.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

- 10 [CAR No. 2016-166](#) 1903 E. Marshall Street - Modify previously approved plans for a new multi-family dwelling to change proposed window and siding materials.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus, seconded by Mr. McRoberts, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the windows be true or simulated divided lite with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar and the smaller muntin, as presented, be used. The Commission deferred the review of the proposed fiber cement panels and the modifications to the alley elevation. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recused -- 1 - Green

- 11 [CAR No. 2016-167](#) 314 N. 21st Street - Modify plans for previously approved porch reconstruction.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts stated that the Commission members have a letter in their packets from the neighbors requesting approval of the project. Ms. Pitts presented the staff report.

Mr. Nate Smith, the owner, stated that the Commission approved the plans for the porch reconstruction last August. He stated that he hired someone specialized in TPO to perform the work. Mr. Smith stated that they had a disagreement on what was

ordered and what was built and stated that he paid for the final porch that was built. Mr. Smith stated that they are trying to sell the building and added that he and the neighbors like the porch as it was rebuilt and stated that it is not an exact match to the previous porch but states that it does match the neighborhood. Mr. Smith also stated that he would like approval to keep the porch as it was rebuilt.

Mr. Hughes stated that it is an unfortunate situation and added that the application seems clear cut.

Mr. Yates stated that the photographs that were presented of other buildings are new construction and stated that one example was a reconstruction because the house was too deteriorated. He added that the house with the taupe siding is new construction.

Mr. Klaus stated that driving up the street and seeing the bell cast roof is a striking feature of that street and stated that missing one is detrimental. He also stated that he feels terrible that the mistake was made and that applicant attempted to adhere to the previously approved plan. Mr. Klaus stated that he feels the porch roof shape is a defining aspect of that street and the house and it would be a shame to lose that feature.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Klaus, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- 12 [CAR No. 2016-168](#) 811 1/2 N. 24th Street - Rehabilitate a home with fire damage by installing new windows, fiber cement siding, and porch details.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the fiber cement siding be smooth and unbeaded; colors be provided to staff for administrative review and approval; the replacement windows be true or simulated divided lite with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar between the glass; the door replacement be based on photographic evidence; and the porch replacement be based on physical and photographic evidence and detailed drawings of the proposed replacement be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- 13 [CAR No. 2016-135a](#) 2230 Venable Street - Construct two new multifamily structures and rehabilitate an existing structure to include new windows.

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

Ms. Pitts read the staff report.

Ms. Lynn McAteer, with Better Housing Coalition, stated that they really appreciate the opportunity to come back to the Commission and present the changes that they have made to the design of Venable Street. Ms. McAteer stated that they want to thank the staff, Commission members, and the community members for working with them on this project over the past year. Ms. McAteer stated that today they really thought it was important to review the evolution of this development since its inception in 2015. Ms. McAteer stated that after completing their site assembly, the development team begin to visualize the development potential for the site and stated that they met with the City Planning staff in the summer of 2015 to review the zoning requirements and what was allowable under the R-63 zoning. Ms. McAteer stated that after they were successful in getting their financing, they initiated the community involvement phase. Ms. McAteer stated that they had their first meeting with the Union Hill Civic Association in October 2015 and stated that she presented the site plan that clearly identified a 3-story structure on Jessamine Street with the renovation of the existing Citadel of Hope and the construction of the 3-story building on Venable Street. Ms. McAteer stated that at the meeting she explained to them the timeline and goals to provide high quality affordable housing to the community. Ms. McAteer stated that she did not receive any negative push back or feedback from the community at that time and stated that since June of 2016 they had over 20 conversations with City Staff, community members and Commission members to talk about this project. Ms. McAteer stated that they worked diligently with their architect, Mr. Walter Parks and Associates, to address everybody's concerns and stated that one of things that is really important to Better Housing Coalition is that they are accountable to many stakeholders, including the City, the Commission, the neighborhood, and their investors. Ms. McAteer stated that most importantly they are accountable to the residents that are going to live in the development and stated for that reason they have put in a lot of time and effort into this development. Ms. McAteer stated that it is a high quality affordable product that they believe will be an asset to this community and to the City.

Mr. Andy Condlin, on behalf of Better Housing Coalition, showed the Commission some slides including the evolution of the design. Mr. Condlin stated that they looked at the various forms in the Union Hill District and stated that there are a lot of large scale buildings in the neighborhood. Mr. Condlin stated that they have addressed the siting, materials, colors, the form and the height that staff has brought up in the original staff report and in the last meeting including using the prevailing front and side yard setback patterns based on historical patterns on the block, addressing the prominent streets, and screening the parking lot. Mr. Condlin stated that all of this is within the R-63 zoning provision and stated that in 2009 the historic overlay district was bought into this area of Union Hill as well as the R-63 through a comprehensive rezoning which allows for an urban type development of this type. Mr. Condlin stated that they have met all of the requirements and considerations and asked that the Commission approve this project.

Public Comment

Ms. McAteer stated that they had a number of people that were here to speak in support of the project and stated that they have submitted some letters which included Shawn Martin, The New Vision Civic Association and Reverend Andrew Terry who were all here but had to leave for family obligations.

Ms. Fredia Green Bowlin, member of New Vision Civic Association, speaking as a residence near Union Hill, came to speak for the project.

Ms. Ann Wortham, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Ms. Marion Fields, speaking as a residence and business owner of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Ms. Mary Field, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the

project and is opposed to the project.

Ms. Liz Oppalack, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Mr. Charlie Fields, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Mr. Mark Laferty, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Ms. Katie Thomas, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Mr. Robert Worley, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Ms. Nancy Lampert, Thomas, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Mr. Norbert Fields, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Mr. Chris Jones, speaking as a residence of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project and is opposed to the project.

Ms. Pitts read an anonymous letter from a residence of Union Hill, and he spoke against the project and is opposed to the project.

Closed Public Discussion

Commission Discussion

Mr. Bond inquired about the changes in zoning for the R-63 and Mr. Condlin stated that in 2009 there was a comprehensive rezoning in the area that was in parallel discussions with the old and historic district. Mr. Condlin stated that R-53 was considered but stated that it was too suburban so the community pushed for R-63. Mr. Condlin stated that there was a discussion if they wanted lower heights they could have done R-8 and stated that The R-63 was specifically provided for this area on this property for that reason. Mr. Bond inquired if this was done by the Planning Commission, and Ms. Pitts stated that it was done by City Council. Mr. Bond inquired what the prior zoning was and Mr. Condlin stated that it was R-7.

A citizen from the audience stated that the neighborhood both Church Hill North and Union Hill both went through a rezoning effort about 5 years ago and they rezoned from R-7 to R-63 which is a new zoning that was developed in Richmond to essentially allow for corner commercial and more density. The citizen stated that they did not want R-7 because it was for single family homes on big lots and they did not think that was right or in keeping with the neighborhood so they worked with the City and the Planning Commission to put R-63 in place so that they could have all the restaurants, butchers and cleaners that they have in place now. The citizen stated that they were concerned about big high stories and things that were not compatible so they made it an historic district and stated that there was a lot of community discussion and their biggest discussion and concern was with towering buildings coming in. During the rezoning conversations, the citizen went on to tell the neighbors not to worry because there is a historical overlay and if it is not compatible then it cannot be approved. The citizen stated that it is really critical that those two pieces come together and stated that they went hand in hand with R-63 because they wanted an urban neighborhood. Mr. Condlin stated that they do believe that they meet all of the Design Guidelines and stated that R-63 does allow for the heights that they see at this location and that they do think it is appropriate for this area and the neighborhood.

Mr. Bond stated the applicant has addressed some issues by changing the materials but scale is still really big issue here. Mr. Bond stated that himself and Mr. Yates met with the applicant and at that meeting discussed concerns with the scale. Mr. Bond

stated that he has a lot of difficulty with the scale of the project in this location and stated that there are a lot of building that are higher blocks away but they are not in this environment and feels that is a critical issue.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if the concern was because it is so close to the other buildings across the street and inquired if the building was further central to the site would it be less concerning. Mr. Bond stated that it is still a scale thing an isolated building in the middle of the block doesn't contribute much to the neighborhood, and it would be surrounding by parking.

Mr. Hughes stated that the renderings have drastically improved in regard to the materials and colors and stated that the way it is put together speaks to the neighborhood a lot better than before.

Mr. Klaus stated that the massing and height has not come down enough to address the concerns of the Commission in terms of how it relates to the residential nature of that street and stated that building number 3 on that commercial street could get away with the height, but the Jessamine building has made no attempts to go down with the grade and becomes taller at the other end. Mr. Klaus stated that there has been no attempt to change the massing although the façade has been changed but it does not address the concerns of the Commission.

Mr. Green echoed Mr. Klaus and stated that the articulation and materials have improved and it is a much more attractive elevation and much more in keeping with the guidelines. Mr. Green stated that the things that have not been addressed are height, mass and scale and stated that they remain issues. Mr. Green stated that everything else has been addressed very successfully but stated that the height and scale still are not addressed and have not changed since the Commission first saw the project.

Mr. Hendricks stated that Carrington Street is particularly not to his liking as it fronts onto a public park and it has a 10' brick wall at the street level. Ms. Pitts clarified that it is not a public park across the street.

Mr. Hughes stated that he feels it is bigger than the other buildings surrounding it and stated that he does not have a problem with the density and stated that maybe that is something they can discuss at the quarterly meeting regarding how do they address the density. Mr. Hughes stated that they have a lot of these project coming before them and felt that this is best one he has seen.

Mr. Green stated that he does not have an issue with the density and stated that it is the distribution of the density across the site that is an issue and stated that they can use the site in other ways like with less parking.

Mr. Green stated that for him the density is not the issue and stated that it is the way the density is treated on the site that creates additional height and mass and stated that it does not blend well with the other neighbors.

Mr. Yates stated that he shares some of Mr. Green's views and stated that it addresses the Citadel of Hope because they are the same height and stated that while he has some concerns about the massing of a single building, there has been significant improvements with the design and he would be happy to support it.

Mr. Hendricks made a motion to deny the project based on the mass, height and scale being incompatible with the old and historic district. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus and passed 5-2-0 (Yates and Hughes opposed).

A motion was made by Hendricks, seconded by Klaus, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied as the Commission found the massing

and scale of the proposed new construction not compatible with the old and historic district in which it is located.continued. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - Bond, Green, Hendricks, Klaus and McRoberts

No -- 2 - Yates and Hughes

- 14 [CAR No. 2016-152](#) 215 W. Clay St. - Rehabilitate the existing structure to include replacing or infilling with wood panels the existing windows and doors.

Attachments: [Application and Plans 11/22/16](#)

[Site Plan](#)

[Staff Report 11/22/16](#)

[Application and Plans 10/25/16](#)

[Staff Report 10/25/16](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus, seconded by Mr. Hendricks, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the existing transom above the proposed fixed door remain and the final design for the proposed wall sign be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- 15 [CAR No. 2016-126](#) 2400 E. Franklin Street - Construct a single family dwelling.

Attachments: [Application and Plans 11/22/16](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report 11/22/16](#)

[Application and Plans 8/23/16](#)

[Staff Report 8/23/16](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Hendricks, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the metal siding be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - Bond, Green, Yates, Hendricks and Klaus

No -- 2 - Hughes and McRoberts

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 16 [CAR No. 2016-164](#) 10-14 E. Broad Street - Construct rooftop additions on commercial structures.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and stated that staff has concerns that the 10 foot setback of the addition on 14 East Broad Street is not adequate to minimize the impact on the façade and will be highly visible from Broad Street. Staff believes the setback of the addition on 10-12 East Broad Street is appropriate. As the vertical alignment of window openings is characteristic of the district, staff recommended the openings on the façade of the addition at 10-12 East Broad Street be vertically aligned. The windows on the visible southeast elevation reflect the fenestration founding in the district. Staff recommended the applicant speak with the building division regarding the windows which are proposed along the property line.

Mr. Gray Oliver, representing the owner Lewis Adams, the owner, and Bruce Parretz, the architect, were present to answer questions. Mr. Oliver stated that the key for their team is to maintain core design principles, including recognizing the unique nature of the site. Mr. Oliver stated that they want to maintain and improve the current streetscape and added that they will be redoing the façade on 14 E. Broad Street to restore it to the original. He also stated that in their view this will be a mixed use building. Mr. Oliver stated that the two key things that will drive for this is area is scalability and sustainability so they can deliver a mixed use approach that meets the non-valuing requirements of a commercial lease which has no value in today's market. Mr. Oliver stated that they include the residential use for the local banks who will support this effort. Mr. Oliver then stated that the left side of the project will utilize federal and state historic rehabilitation tax credits. Mr. Oliver went on to discuss the setbacks and step down heights.

Mr. Bruce Perretz, from Perretz and Young Architects, stated that in the original submission they proposed 8 story buildings that were set back and stated that the current proposal is for 6 story buildings, in response to the Commissioners' comments regarding height and setbacks. Mr. Perretz stated that at this point they are looking at massing and form and they are still making adjustments to materials and design on the upper floors, adding that in all likelihood they will not use brick but it will be some lighter material. Mr. Perretz went on to discuss the materials, height and setbacks of the proposed design.

Mr. Bond inquired if there was a problem with the windows on the right side and stated that fire shutters and sprinklers could be used and that is a problem. Mr. Bond stated that the applicant can use materials that will be very light like glass and steel. Mr. McRoberts disagreed and stated that he wasn't going to comment on materials. He added that he thinks they hit the ball out of the ballpark on the left hand side as the proposed addition is stepped back and contrasting. Mr. McRoberts also stated that all of staff's comments are well placed. He commented on the right hand side, stating the addition doesn't look subordinate to the existing historic structure and added that it needs to be set back further or it needs to be stair stepped more.

Mr. McRoberts stated that he would be very aware of the visibility of the design because it's critical, and stated that the proposed design needs to be subordinate and fall away from the historic structure. He concluded by stating that if they can make that adjustment it looks like a very nice project as far as the mass and scaling.

Mr. Yates inquired if DHR and NPS had commented on 14 E. Broad Street as they now consider adjacent projects in their review. Mr. Yates stated that he doesn't think 10 feet is anywhere near enough of a setback because the addition completely overpowers the existing building. Mr. Yates stated that he can almost guarantee that both of those

organizations are going to have issues with the proposal at 14 E. Broad Street even though they are not receiving tax credits as it is an adjacent property to a tax credit project being developed by the same developers. Mr. Yates stated that he thinks that the setback on 14 E. Broad Street needs to be pushed back further.

Mr. Perretz inquired if the Commissioners were talking about pushing the addition back further and Mr. McRoberts stated yes, adding that he also was concerned with the proposed height. He also stated that there are 3 stories existing and 3 stories proposed above, suggesting that they might reduce the height of the addition by one story. Mr. McRoberts stated that if the addition were set back enough he might be open to a three story addition.

Mr. Yates stated that a stair step on the addition could work. He also stated that the first floor of both buildings have very high ceilings and stated that the elevation drawings on A8 show a huge band of brick above those windows. Mr. Yates stated that he didn't know what is existing but the storefront should be more transparent rather than being all brick.

The Commission members briefly commented on the setback of the additions.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

Adjournment