



Meeting Minutes - Final
Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, December 13, 2016

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

Present -- 7 - * Sanford Bond, * Bryan Green, * Joseph Yates, * Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor,
* James W. Klaus, * Andrew Ray McRoberts and * Commissioner David C.
Cooley

Absent -- 2 - * Gerald Jason Hendricks and * Nathan Hughes

2 Roll Call

3 Approval of Minutes

Ms. Pitts stated that in regards to conceptual review, denials, and deferrals, staff feels that it would be worthwhile to have a little more information included in the minutes so staff, the Commission, and the applicant will know what the Commission members' concerns were. Ms. Pitts stated that the other Commissions do not give detailed information about their meetings, but they do not have conceptual reviews.

September 27, 2016

A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts, seconded by Mr. Bond, that the minutes from September be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus, McRoberts and Cooley

October 25, 2016

Will be approved at the next CAR meeting

November 23, 2016

Will be approved at the next CAR meeting

4 Request for New Old and Historic District

Ms. Chen stated that they had a request this month from Historic Richmond Foundation and the Richmond Randolph Lodge #19 of the Masons to consider a single property for a City Old and Historic District nomination for the Mason's Hall at 1805 and 1807 E. Franklin Street. Ms. Chen stated that it is listed in the Shockoe Valley Tobacco Row National Register District and discussed the history of the Mason's Hall. Ms. Chen stated that staff is very supportive of this building becoming an individual City Old and Historic District and added that it is one of the few buildings of this vintage in this location that is not protected by the City Old and Historic District designation. Ms. Chen stated that it is probably among both the more architecturally and historically significant buildings in the City and stated that staff is in support of this nomination moving forward.

Mr. McRoberts inquired if there was a reason why this couldn't be added to the district across the street and Ms. Chen responded that it can be done either way and that the process for doing either will be the same, both would have to go before City Council.

Ms. Cyane Crump, the Executive Director of Historic Richmond, and Mr. Bill Thomas and Charlie Huntley, of Richmond Randolph No. 19, came up to answer questions. Ms. Crump stated that both of these entities are supportive of this nomination and would like to see some additional protections put on the building. She added that it is one of the 3 oldest structures in the City and they are entirely supportive of the nomination. Ms. Crump stated that in regards to the process of designation, they would be supportive of whichever processes is easiest.

The Commission members briefly discussed the nomination and made a motion to approve it.

A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - Bond, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus and McRoberts

Abstain -- 2 - Green and Cooley

1807 E. Franklin Street (Mason's Hall)

5 Other Business

Secretary's Report

Ms. Pitts stated that the new application and checklists have been added to the website. She added that applicants have been using the new application and stated that staff is considering making further changes. Ms. Pitts stated that now that the application suggests meeting with staff prior to making a submission, she has had several meetings with applicants prior to them submitting their application. She added that staff hopes this will help ensure that they get high quality applications with all the information that the Commission needs to make their decision.

Ms. Pitts stated that the Better Housing Coalition filed an appeal last Thursday for the application for 2230 Venable Street, which was heard at the last meeting. She stated that she has 15 days to prepare the Commission's response. Ms. Pitts stated that the Better Housing Coalition had advised that their intention is to return for the January meeting with a new plan that addresses the massing on Jessamine.

Ms. Pitts stated that they have a Planner I who is scheduled to begin on December 27th and stated that her initial goal will be to follow up with enforcements. Ms. Pitts added that her name is Chelsea Jeffries and she has a Master's Degree in Planning and teaches a historic preservation class at VCU. Ms. Pitts also stated that they have a graduate student from VCU that is going to be here doing his capstone project. Ms. Chen elaborated, stating that they were approached by a VCU graduate student interested in studying the Commission of Architectural Review and stated that staff suggested examining the community perception of the Commission and perceptions about what their process is and how it works. Ms. Chen stated that those are the kind of questions that Jonah is going to be looking into.

Ms. Pitts discussed the new equipment that the Department will be getting for the conference room. Ms. Pitts also stated that there are concerns regarding Commission's

rules of procedure for public comment. She added that there is some concern that they sometimes receive comments minutes prior to the meeting, making it difficult to ensure that all Commission members are receiving the information. Ms. Pitts stated that she was hoping that the Commission could amend the rules of procedures to note that all written comments from the public must be received no later than close of the business day on the Monday prior to the meeting.

Administrative Approvals

Ms. Pitts distributed copies of the administrative approval report.

Enforcement Report

Ms. Pitts stated that one of the big issues that they are trying to resolve is 2407 Cedar Street which is the home that was spray painted on the exterior. She stated that staff has been on contact with the landlord and the son, who is the tenant, and stated that the ultimate goal is to remove all the vinyl siding, repair the siding underneath, or install Hardiplank on all of the elevations. Ms. Pitts stated that staff was expecting to receive an application but one was not submitted so they are going to follow up with a notice of pending prosecution. Ms. Pitts stated that the applicant is hoping to bring in an application for the January meeting and stated that staff will proceed with court action if they don't hear from the applicant or receive an application.

Other Committee Reports

Mr. Green stated that the Urban Design Committee reviewed the City's new Safety Communication Tower system project that involves all of the surrounding counties and stated that the plans are rather substantial. Mr. Green then stated that the Commission's quarterly meeting is January 10th at his office at 6pm and stated that if any members had suggestions for topics to let them know. Mr. Green also stated that he wished to discuss the issue of applicants approaching Commission members to discuss their projects prior to the public meeting. He added that he wished to discuss this at the quarterly meeting so that all the Commission members will be on same page and have the same information regarding the projects.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about not seeing any single property districts listed in the guideline handbook. Ms. Pitts stated that staff is going to revise the guidelines.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Mr. Yates to move item number #2 from the consent agenda to the regular agenda, seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 6-1-0 (Klaus opposed).

A motion was made by Mr. Yates to move item #5 from the regular agenda to the consent agenda, seconded by Mr. Klaus and passed 7-0-0.

A motion was made by Mr. Green to move item #4 from the consent agenda to the regular agenda, seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 7-0-0.

A motion was made by Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Green, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus and McRoberts

Abstain -- 1 - Cooley

- 1 [CAR No. 2016-170](#) 602 N. 22nd Street - Replace the wood siding on the secondary elevations with fiber cement siding.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Green, that this be approved provided that the following conditions are met: that the siding be smooth, unbeaded, and installed with a reveal consistent with the historic reveal; and paint colors be submitted for administrative review and approval.

- 3 [CAR No. 2016-172](#) 2302 E. Grace Street - Rebuild the porch on the existing outbuilding to re-orient the stairs.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Green, that this be approved provided that the following conditions are met: the structure be painted or opaquely stained a color to be reviewed and administratively approved by staff; the work be performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions; and any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service be submitted to CAR staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

- 5 [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 moved from the regular agenda to the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Green, that this be approved provided that the following conditions are met: the existing hand rail remain and full-height, wooden, louvered-shutters be installed behind the rail to provide the desired privacy. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus and McRoberts

Recused -- 1 - Cooley

REGULAR AGENDA

- 2 [CAR No. 2016-171](#) 2308 W. Grace Street - Construction of a front patio and retaining wall.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Plan](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This item was moved from the consent agenda to the regular agenda.

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus, seconded by Mr. McRoberts, that this be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following condition is met: the planting between the proposed wall and the street be increased in height to screen the wall. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Bond, Green, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus, McRoberts and Cooley

No -- 1 - Yates

- 4 [CAR No. 2016-176](#) 2600 E. Franklin Street - Installation of hardscaping in the front yard.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Plan](#)

[Staff Report](#)

This item was moved from the consent agenda to the regular agenda.

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Klaus, that this be approved for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following condition is met: a plan to screen the pebbles from the street be provided to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus, McRoberts and Cooley

- 6 [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](#)

There were 9 citizens that spoke in opposition to this project.

Mr. McRoberts stated that he supports the staff recommendations. Mr. Bond stated that he concurs with Mr. McRoberts and stated that the structure is just too big.

Mr. Green stated that the plan doesn't address the underlying issues which include the rear portion being too tall and the structure having too much mass. Mr. Cooley inquired if it is too tall and too big. Mr. Green answered yes, stating that the structure is highly visible from many vantage points, and added that the slopes are not advantageous and there is nothing that can be done about this. Mr. Green then stated that it is a massive

structure at the rear of the lot and stated that he thinks the applicant can design a fairly sizable building. Mr. Green added that the building that they are trying to screen in the back is fundamentally too big. Mr. Green stated that the design is awkward and there is nothing in the district that looks like this and added that the height, massing and form do not conform to the Guidelines. Mr. Cooley inquired if different materials on the third story would make it more palatable and Mr. Green answered that using a two-story building to screen a wider three-story building just is not working. and stated that he believes ultimately the solution is to return with a 4 bay building that is a little wider. Mr. Green stated that proposing two buildings on the site is not solving the underlying problem, adding that one building would be compatible with the neighborhood and would fit the form and materials found in the neighborhood. Mr. Cooley mentioned that they are proposing 8 parking spaces and Mr. Green stated that the Commission doesn't review parking. Mr. Cooley stated that he believes that when the design was last reviewed he asked about zoning and inquired if they were zoned to do this or would a variance be required. The applicant responded yes, the design met zoning. Mr. Cooley stated that they encourage the applicants to think outside the box and create a design that has the correct mass and scale.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor agreed with Mr. Green that the design would actually work better if the structure spanned the entire width of the site. She added that if the design were flipped, with a longer building in the front than in the back, the applicant might then convince the Commission to support a two-story carriage house, a design that will probably reduce their apartment count and their parking spaces. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that this form would fit much better and stated that they have seen inventive designs from the applicant before and thinks they can give the Commission one again.

Mr. Klaus inquired if Ms. Aarons-Sydnor was suggesting a longer two-story structure in the front of the site and not a three-story structure. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor reiterated that she meant a two-story structure that runs across the entire width of the property.

Mr. Green inquired if Ms. Aarons-Sydnor was proposing a height for the wider 4-bay structure and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor replied that it should remain two stories.

Mr. Cooley stated that he thinks the applicant is attempting to hide one building behind another and stated that he wants to encourage different ideas.

Mr. Yates stated that from the street it reads as three separate buildings with no continuity and that is one of the many things that bothers him.

A motion was made by Yates, seconded by Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to provide the applicant the opportunity the opportunity to revise the plans to address the Commission's concerns with the building form, height, scale, and massing. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus, McRoberts and Cooley

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

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Jeff Geiger, representing the owner, made a request to defer the application until the February meeting.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the applicant was going to build the fence or paint the brick mold prior to getting approval. Mr. Geiger stated that they were willing to go ahead and paint and do the fence work now assuming that they get approval from Ms. Pitts and added that those items will be completed before the February meeting and then they will come back with proposals for the windows for the February meeting.

Mr. Green stated that he wanted to be clear that he is not sure that painting the brick or vinyl mold will have any impact on their discussion and stated that he wanted to make sure that if administrative approval is granted for that work, and he is not sure that it will be granted, that will not impact their decision either way. Mr. Green added that the Guidelines are very clear about vinyl windows.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred at the request of the applicant. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus, McRoberts and Cooley

- 8 [CAR No. 2016-173](#) 2301 Cedar Street - Infill existing basement window openings and install fire department connections.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she just worked on a Historic office building in the same condition and stated that the windows and wells were all retained because it was a State building that was reviewed by DHR. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that a solution was found for that project and feels that the basement windows are an important feature on the building, adding that resources exist to find a solution to the water infiltration issue.

Mr. Yates stated that he agrees and added that the basement windows are an important feature of the building and they need to be maintained. Mr. Yates then stated that there is a floor drain under the curb there and added that if it is cleaned out it will continue to operate. Mr. Yates stated that one of the reasons the water is penetrating the sills is because they have rotted out and haven't been replaced. Mr. Yates added that there is a major roof drain in the corner and there are other solutions for making those difficult areas drain properly.

Mr. Green stated that there is a major crack in the roof drain in the rear and added that may be a major source of the water infiltration. Mr. Green added that the existing footer drains can successfully drain water and that there are ways to retain the window wells. Mr. Cooley then stated that this is certainly the time to make those repairs while the building is under construction and added that there are drains in most of the wells, but masonry is not going to stop water.

Mr. Yates mentioned that the other issue with the fire department connection will likely be resolved as the Church is working to get it moved to a less intrusive location. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a amendment that the owner return to staff with a sketch of the location for the fire department connection on the non-historic tan brick and clarified that that portion can be administratively approved and does not have to come back for full Commission review.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved as submitted for the

reasons cited in the staff report. The Commission deferred the portion of the application related to the infilling of the basement windows and light wells to provide the applicant the opportunity to explore other options for addressing the water infiltration issues. The Commission approved the installation of the fire department connections provided that the following conditions are met: the connections be installed on the non-historic brick and a plan of the connection location be provided to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus, McRoberts and Cooley

- 9 [CAR No. 2016-114](#) 2411 M Street - Construct a new 3 story mixed use building with an enclosed rooftop amenity room and terraces

Attachments: [Application and Plans - 2/28/17](#)

[Site Plan](#)

[Staff Report - 2/28/17](#)

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

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

[Application & Plans - 7/26/16](#)

[Staff Report - 7/26/16](#)

There were 14 residents who spoke in support of the project and 13 residents who spoke against the project.

Ms. Pitts stated that the applicants are required to go through an SUP process for the 4th floor.

Mr. Klaus stated that he doesn't have a problem with the 3-stories and stated that it is appropriate for the site, adding that the 4th story maybe one story too high and questioned if the 4th story is critical to the project. Mr. Klaus concluded by stating that he can go either way because the 4th story is not as visible and added that he thinks it's appropriate for that site.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is also very anxious to see the project completed as a resident and added that it will be a wonderful amenity. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor agreed that some of the concerns of the neighbors are justified and stated that she doesn't believe enough has been done to break up the scale of the building. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor then stated that the balconies are not a feature that is normally seen in the district and added that she is concerned about how prominent they are. She also stated that the height should make a statement on the corner, commenting that perhaps the 3-story portion and other 2-story portion behind the stairs recognize a step-down in scale from a more commercial corner to a more residential corner. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she recognizes the change in the design and that she appreciates that but she doesn't know if it has gone far enough yet.

Mr. McRoberts stated that he shares some of the concerns with the mass and height of the design and added that they are not compatible with the buildings across the street and in the neighborhood. Mr. McRoberts then commented that it is a large building, and the applicants have done a good job responding to some of the Commission's comments. He commented that he likes the darker brick and added that he also has some concerns about the balconies being inconsistent with the historic district. Mr. McRoberts stated if there were 3 bays without the balconies it would be a much more

attractive design. He also stated that he appreciates the applicants setting the 3rd floor back and thinks that helps but stated that from his perspective there is still a compatibility problem.

Mr. Bond stated that he thinks the developers and the owners have responded to the Commission's comments and added that it sounds like they have responded to the neighborhood comments as well. He then commented that he tends to agree that the assembly space on the 4th floor may not be necessary. Mr. Bond stated that he agrees with staff in that the white paneling on the 3rd floor should be subdued in color and added that the articulation on the façade tends to break up the mass of the building so the scale seems to give it a more residential feel and doesn't appear as big. Mr. Bond concluded that his only concern would be the very top assembly space.

Mr. Yates commented that he sees the building as a link between residential and commercial uses and stated that the overall height doesn't bother him. Mr. Yates then stated that the darker portion of the building relates directly to the two story buildings surrounding it and by toning down the color of the 3rd floor it will blend into the neighborhood better. Mr. Yates added that the balconies are indicative of a new urban context and though they wouldn't have been on a historic building of that period, they do enliven the building. Mr. Yates then commented that he thinks the structure will blend into the neighborhood very well and he likes the design, though he would prefer not to see the 4th floor. He concluded by stating that the rest of the building will be an asset to the community.

Mr. Green stated that one of the things he does like about the proposed design is that it is not higher than street level and the ground level is very active, reiterating that he likes that aspect of the design very much. Mr. Green then stated that the uniqueness of the site allows for more massing, however the 4th floor may be too high. Mr. Green agreed that the applicants have addressed comments well. He reiterated that it is a unique site and stated that he did prefer the original balcony design which was a simple punch recess that was more massive with more masonry enclosures which read less like balconies.

Mr. Cooley stated that he hears positive comments regarding the retail opportunities but that he hears less positive comments regarding the number of people the project will bring to help support those retail amenities. Mr. Cooley added that in some places when standing on the curb you're going to look up and see the balconies on the third floor. He also stated that it would be better to see what is behind the balconies and added that he doesn't think the roof top will be visible. Mr. Cooley then stated that you will only see the top of the building when driving up. He commented that the applicants have softened the top two levels and added that he can see the 4th level as a good place to have a gathering or event that would be very popular.

Mr. Green again stated that the ground floor would be successful and active.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor commented that it is important to have either a real door or a sense of an entry coming from Union Hill. She then stated that she believes there is a bridge between the commercial area and the residential area and stated that it needs to respond to that scale and commented that the 3 stories all the way around without a setback at the circle seems appropriate. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor added that 2 stories with a roof terrace on the Western end seems to address the scale at that end.

Mr. Cooley stated that the 4th floor on page 17 is hidden by the corner and added that it is most visible on page 16 and stated that he doesn't think the 4th floor is that much of a big deal because it doesn't cover the entire roof.

Mr. Bond stated that the Commission should defer the project so that the applicant can redesign the 4th floor to be less visible, address the Union Hill entrance and incorporate staff recommendations to darken the color of the 2nd floor.

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred so the applicant will have the opportunity to revise the plans to redesign the 4th story to minimize its visibility from the surrounding streets, to include an entrance into Union Hill on the 24th and M Street elevations, and to incorporate conditions included in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No -- 3 - Aarons-Sydnor, McRoberts and Cooley

- 10 [CAR No. 2016-175](#) 2516 Monument Avenue - Construct a new partially enclosed porch at the rear of the structure.

Attachments: [Application and Plans - 1/24/17](#)

[Site Map](#)

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

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

The application was withdrawn by the applicant.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was withdrawn

- 11 [CAR No. 2016-177](#) 2112 E. Clay Street - Construct two attached single family dwellings.

Attachments: [Application and Plans - 1/24/17](#)

[Site Plan](#)

[Staff Report - 1/24/17](#)

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

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

The Commission members voiced concerns about the tree being cut down without having a Certificate of Appropriateness and asked what the applicants were going to do to mitigate the removal.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor had concerns about the façade design on the side street and stated that they need more than aligning the windows.

Mr. Yates inquired about the bays and suggested that they changed the angle of the bays to match the adjacent houses.

Mr. Yates inquired about the zoning issues and the front yard setback. Ms. Pitts responded that staff tries not to comment on zoning issues and stated that she was not sure about the setbacks.

Mr. Bond stated that it will be considered two front yards.

Mr. Yates stated that given the number of issues that they have he is going to suggest

that they defer the application and ask the applicant to come back with revised drawings per the comments of the Commission members.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Klaus, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to provide the applicant the opportunity to revise the plans to deepen the front bays; to alter the North 22nd Street elevation to include elements of a corner elevation as encouraged by the Commission's Guidelines; to include dimensions for all elements; to examine ways to mitigate for the loss of the tree, and to include a context site plan. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus, McRoberts and Cooley

- 12 [CAR No. 2016-178](#) 1902-1908 Princess Anne Avenue - Modify previously approved plans to change the proposed window material.

Attachments: [Application and Plans - 1/24/17](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report - 1/24/17](#)

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

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

Mr. Cooley stated that he has to believe the applicant that he can't achieve LEED certification another way and stated that he cannot imagine how the performance of vinyl windows can't be achieved with a material that is more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Klaus stated that he was okay with the exception if it's required for LEED certification. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it is not required for LEED certification.

Mr. Cooley inquired why LEED certification is important for this project. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it will result in a lower energy bill and better air quality, adding that she can't validate that there is an acceptable wood option.

A motion was made by Bond, seconded by McRoberts, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved. The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye -- 3 - Bond, Klaus and McRoberts

No -- 4 - Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor and Cooley

After further discussion regarding the decision that no action was taken on the project the Commission members re-voted on the project and deferred it.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Cooley, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred provided that the applicant have the opportunity to explore alternatives to obtain LEED certification.. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, McRoberts and Cooley

No -- 1 - Klaus

Abstain -- 1 - Bond

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 13 [CAR No. 2016-174](#) 533 Mosby Street - Construct a new single family dwelling and a garage.

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

Mr. Bond stated that he agrees with staff's comments and inquired about the project drawings and dimensions and whether there are requirements for submissions. Ms. Pitts stated that there are requirements for submissions and that the applicant was hoping to come for final review however staff strongly recommended against it. Ms. Pitts stated that they allow applicants to come for conceptual review without fulfilling all the requirements for submissions.

Mr. McRoberts stated that staff's comments are appropriate and commented that the design doesn't relate to anything in the district.

Mr. Green agreed that the form is foreign and is not like anything in the district.

Mr. Klaus inquired if this is a buildable lot and Mr. Yates stated that is another issue entirely. Ms. Pitts responded that they have been in contact with the Zoning Department and with Mr. Duckhardt.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that as full disclosure was mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, she informed the Commission that she met with the designer in October and added that the design didn't change per their discussion. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the designer told her that there is an easement for rear access and he confirmed that it is a buildable lot. She then stated that at the meeting she had suggested that the roof form would probably be the biggest issue and that the corten steel might also be an issue. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she told the designer that the burnt wood finish might be acceptable because there is wood siding in the district but stated that they need to somehow demonstrate that they have looked at the Guidelines and have met them. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the intent of the project is to be a tiny house and added that she told the designer about all of the dimensions that they need to have.

Mr. Green agreed that the roof form would be an issue. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor suggested that the applicant put solar panels on the garage if they can get enough roof area.

Mr. Yates stated that the front of the house doesn't align with anything on that block and acknowledged that they shouldn't deal with zoning but stated that he would feel a lot better if he knew that this was something that could be built. Ms. Chen stated that per her conversation with Zoning they are seeking a variance to pull the house closer to the street so that it does align.

Mr. McRoberts inquired if this would be an administrative variance and Ms. Chen responded it would.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

Adjournment

Mr. Yates adjourned the meeting at 7:39pm