



Meeting Minutes
Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, October 27, 2020

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 2020-093, adopted April 9, 2020. This meeting will be open to participation through electronic communication means by the public and closed to in-person participation by the public. Less than a quorum of Richmond City Commission of Architectural Review members will assemble for this meeting in the 5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall at 900 East Broad Street in Richmond, Virginia 23219, and most Commission members and other staff will participate by teleconference/videoconference via Microsoft Teams.

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

To access or participate, or both, in the Commission of Architectural Review meeting on Tuesday, October 27th, 2020 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES 2020.063](#) Public Access and Participation Instructions - COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

Attachments: [Public Access and Participation Instructions -COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW](#)

Audio of the meeting will be streamed live online at the following web address: <https://richmondva.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. To listen to the meeting's live stream at the web address provided, find and click the link that reads, "In Progress" in the farthest right hand column entitled, "Video". Interested citizens who wish to speak will be given an opportunity to do so by following the outlined in the Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review document. Citizens are encouraged to provide their comments in writing to carey.jones@richmondgov.com in lieu of speaking through audio or video means during the meeting. When submitting your comments by email, be sure to include in your email (i) your full legal name, (ii) any organizations you represent, and (iii) any economic or professional relationships that would be affected by the approval of the application on which you are commenting. The person responsible for receiving written comments is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. All written comments received via email prior to 12:00 p.m. (noon) on Tuesday, October 27th, 2020, will be provided to all members of the Commission of Architectural Review prior to the beginning of the meeting and will be included in the record of the meeting.

Call to Order

Commission Chair Neville Johnson called the October 27, 2020 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:31 pm.

Secretary to the Commission, Carey L. Jones, read the announcement for virtual public meetings:

This meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review will be held as an electronic meeting pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance 2020-093. The public has been notified of this meeting and how to participate by a notice in the Richmond Times Dispatch, and an instruction sheet posted with the agenda on the Legistar website. The public may participate in the meeting by calling *67-804-316-9457 and entering 201-932-327#. Public comment will be heard for each item on the agenda after the applicant has responded to staff recommendations. Members of the public will be limited to 3 minutes for their comments.

The person responsible for receiving the comments from the public is me, Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review.

Commission members are electronically present, none are physically present in City Hall.

We will be conducting a roll call vote with the Secretary stating each Commissioners name prior to voting.

Roll Call

Commissioners Bond, Brewer, and Morgan all joined the meeting within the first 15 minutes

- Present --** 4 - * Commissioner James W. Klaus, * Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., * Commissioner Sean Wheeler and * Commissioner Lawrence Pearson
- Excused --** 4 - * Commissioner Sanford Bond, * Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, * Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and * Commissioner Mitch Danese

Approval of Minutes

August 25, 2020

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, that the August 25, 2020 Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 5 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson
- Excused --** 3 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and Commissioner Mitch Danese

September 22, 2020

The September meeting minutes will be reviewed by the commission at the November meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Secretary's Report

The Secretary's Report was provided by Commission Secretary Ms. Carey L. Jones.

Monuments

In response to the Richmond City Council's call for offers, several parties have made offers for the monuments. Richmond City Council is currently considering what is to be done with both the monuments and the pedestals.

Commissioner Brewer joined the meeting at 3:38 PM.

Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones reported that staff has worked closely with engineers for the project at 1805 Monument Avenue, the conversion of the Leigh Medical Building, to move the building's mechanical equipment away from Monument Avenue or Allen Avenue and bring it closer to the parking area.

The Permit Report includes two Special Use Permits, one listed as "denied" which would be reviewed at this meeting, and one which includes no exterior work. CAR staff will henceforth be working more closely with Land Use staff to check that the SUPs and Plans of Development they are processing are in accord with CAR requirements. Ms. Jones explained that more SUPs may show up in future Permit Reports for this reason.

Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that staff has recently been able to resolve some small violations, involving work such as decking replacement, by working with property owners. More significant recent violations that staff is focusing on are located on Venable Street; one of these is for an altered roof form and another is a painting violation.

A project located at a large triangular property at the corner of M Street and Jefferson Street, which CAR reviewed several times and which also involved an SUP, is finally under construction.

Commission Chair Johnson adjourned the business portion of the meeting at 3:42 PM

Other Committee Reports

CONSENT AGENDA

The regular portion of the meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Commissioner Bond joined the meeting at this juncture.

Ms. Jones re-read the announcement info for virtual meetings.

Commission Chair Johnson explained that there are three sections to the meeting: consent agenda with items not fully reviewed by Commission, regular agenda with items which are reviewed, and conceptual review during which new projects are given an initial review. Items on the consent agenda can be approved without meeting discussion, unless the applicant wishes for it to be removed and placed on the regular for more comprehensive review and discussion.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the Commissioners wished to move any items from the regular agenda to the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to move the 7th item, 2306 E. Grace Street, to the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested amending to include the option of stripping the paint and applying a red wash. Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement, pointing out that the West Grace Street Association had voiced support for either option: painting over in red, or stripping the existing primer paint and applying a red wash.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer
Excused – 1 - Commissioner Danese

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 8th item, 2318 E. Marshall Street, to the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he was aware of an outstanding Zoning issue on this project due to the setback, which could require modification and another review, but stated that this need not impede the Commission voting on it.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the front setback was a matter of concern, in that the body of the building does not align with neighboring buildings. Commissioner Wheeler suggested the decision be amended to include setback alignment adjustment, to be administratively approved. This amendments was accepted.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 6 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer
Excused – 1 - Commissioner Danese
Recused – 1 – Commissioner Lane Pearson

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to move the 12th item, 3135 W Franklin Street, to the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the privacy fence in the front yard should be set back.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the areas of the side elevations which are visible should be brick, but that the entirety of all elevations need not necessarily be brick, given the length of the building, and suggested that the option to have a break in the brick be added as a friendly amendment. This amendments was accepted.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer
Excused – 1 - Commissioner Danese

Public Comment

Mr. Mark Baker introduced himself as representing the applicant for item 12, 3135 W. Franklin Street. Mr. Baker asked for clarification regarding the possibility of a break in the brick, as to what vantage point should be used to determine the visible area of brick, and whether it should be from Franklin Street or from the alley. Commission Chair Johnson

stated that he believed Franklin Street would be the reference point.

Mr. Aaron Olson stated, regarding item 1, 316 N 25th Street, that the applicants had no exception to the staff recommendations, other than the front door, which dates from 1981, being a security concern if it is retained as a half-glass design. Commission Chair Johnson stated that this door detail could be dealt with via administrative review and approval by staff.

Mrs. Priscilla George of 2306 West Grace Street, regarding the 7th item, stated that a red brick color had been selected following consultation with neighbors, and a historic lintel color, Roycroft Mist Gray, had been selected as well. Mrs. George stated that the trim would be white, and that attempts to remove the existing paint had not been successful, and that the applicants would like to proceed with painting the brick a red color that most closely matches its previous color.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any additional public comment. There was none.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, that the consent agenda be approved with staff recommendations. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

1. [COA-079726-2020](#) 316 N. 25th Street - Construct a second-story, rear addition and extend porch; alter doors and fenestration.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the infill brick in the window on the south elevation be inset; the existing brick arch and jambs of the kitchen door be retained, the infill brick below the sill be inset and the new window be of a contemporary design; the extension of the one-story section be parged or finished with stucco to match the second story addition; the visible windows on the addition be of a contemporary design, and window specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; final door specifications be submitted for administrative approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 2. [COA-079808-2020](#) 507 N. 28th Street - Remove a rear deck and construct a one-story screened porch.

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

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the screening be placed on the interior of the posts and railing, to maintain the open appearance of the porch; an alternate material be used to clad the porch roof, specifications to be submitted to staff for administrative review.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 3. [COA-079810-2020](#) 517 N. 26th Street - Construct a shed in the rear yard.

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

A motion was by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application as submitted.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 4. [COA-080182-2020](#) 2211 E. Grace Street - Install pole mounted lights along a masonry wall.

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

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided

the following conditions are met: details on lighting intensity and color be submitted for staff review.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

5. [COA-080420-2020](#) 2320 E. Marshall Street - Rehabilitate an existing building and construct a rear deck.

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

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: elevations for the east and north (rear) elevation and updated interior plans be submitted for staff review and approval; updated roof plan with all chimneys intact be submitted to staff; the applicant submit a detailed window survey and work with staff for an administrative approval of window repairs, or replacement; the arched headers on the north and west elevation remain intact and the windows be retained on the property for possible repairs of the existing historic windows; that if the existing windows are to be bricked in any infill brick be inset between the jambs; the gentlest means possible be used to clean the exterior masonry, and the final paint colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; all unpainted masonry remain unpainted; any replacement materials for the front stairs match the existing in size, materials, profile, and color and the railing specifications be provided to staff for administrative review and approval; all final materials and colors be submitted to staff for review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

6. [COA-080421-2020](#) 2320 E. Marshall Street - Construct a new single-family residence off an alley.

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

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the hardie plank lap siding be smooth and without a decorative bead; final material and color specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; additional information about the proposed upgrades, including the brick pier and lighting, be submitted for staff review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

7. [COA-076916-2020](#) 2306 W. Grace Street - Paint exterior of a previously unpainted masonry building.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(8/25/2020\)](#)

[Staff Report \(8/25/2020\)](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant removes the primer and applies a red wash or the applicant chooses a dark red color that matches the historic brick, and the final paint selection be submitted to staff for administrative approval; and any remaining unpainted masonry remain unpainted.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

8. [COA-080424-2020](#) 2318 E. Marshall Street - Construct a new single-family, attached residence.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided

the following conditions are met: the applicant work with staff on the setback of the building with the final plans to be administratively approved; the entire façade be clad in brick and the vertical wood trim be removed from the design; the cornice line extend the entire width of the façade; the final material specifications and colors be submitted to staff for review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 12. [COA-080403-2020](#) 3135 W. Franklin Street - Construct a new single-family detached residence on a vacant lot.

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

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant add full sized windows on the first and second story of the first bay on the east elevation; the cornice and roof design be revised to be in keeping with patterns found in the district; the applicant reduce the width of the porch roof to not extend beyond the side elevations and to accommodate the gutters necessary for such a flat roof; the applicant work with staff to determine the extent of the masonry return on the side elevations so that it appears to be masonry from West Franklin Street; final material specifications and colors be submitted to staff for review and approval; if the applicant chooses to include the enclosed rear porch, the screening be placed inside of the support posts.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

REGULAR AGENDA

- 9. [COA-066625-2020](#) 517 Catherine Street - Rehabilitate an existing multi-family residence and construct a rear addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(1/28/2020\)](#)
[Staff Report \(1/28/2020\)](#)
[Application and Plans \(10/27/2020\)](#)
[Staff Report \(10/27/2020\)](#)
[Application and Plans](#)
[Base Map](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones noted that a number of public comment letters had been received about this project, and that these had been provided to Commissioners.

Commissioner Klaus stated that most of the many public comments about the project had requested that it should have a front porch. Given that it does not currently have a front porch, Commissioner Klaus expressed doubt that the Commission could actually require this. Ms. Jones confirmed that it would be beyond CAR's authority to require the applicant to rebuild the porch, and stated that she believed the rebuilding of the porch had been planned when the applicant was planning to use the rehabilitation tax credits; since they are no longer planning to pursue this tax credit, they are no longer planning to reconstruct the porch.

The applicant representative, Mr. Jimmy Montgomery, stated that the addition was initially conceived as being 35 feet long, but according to current plans would actually be 25 feet and not 29 feet. Mr. Montgomery stated that the back of the house already has a closed-in porch area, so he had not included that, and this accounts for the four-foot difference. Mr. Montgomery stated that he would be fine with altering plans to more accurately reflect the type of roof, and lowering that roof, as Ms. Jones mentioned.

Mr. Montgomery stated that this received both Part I and Part II approval from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, but that the National Park Service had had issues with the name and address of the house, and had determined that there was not enough historic fabric to preserve for it to qualify as a historic tax credit project. This is why the porch reconstruction component had been removed from the project.

Mr. Montgomery stated that the house currently has significant stabilization issues that they are working to address. Mr. Montgomery stated that in response to neighbor feedback, and due to cutting the rear dimensions by 10 feet, the number of rooms had been reduced, from five and four to two in each unit. Mr. Montgomery stated that the project currently has no zoning issues, and that 3 feet had been pulled off the right-hand property line. The applicants had initially planned to seek a variance to build straight back and keep the tuck more pronounced on the left side of the structure, but due to neighbor opposition the applicants determined that this would not be possible.

Mr. Montgomery stated that a specific measurement for an acceptable depth would be helpful, if the Commissioners were able to agree on a number.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the plan currently submitted is the one approved by DHR. Mr. Montgomery stated that the one submitted to DHR had included the front porch. Commissioner Wheeler asked if that was the only change. Mr. Montgomery stated that in the new plans the porch is not present, the rear addition has been altered from being a straight line on the right-hand side to coming in three feet on the right-hand side and being tucked on the left-hand side. Mr. Montgomery stated that DHR had requested

the inset on the left, which was why the applicants had been attempting to get a zoning variance on the right, and this is why the applicants had changed it in that direction.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he was having difficulty determining how much of a reduction in length to recommend due to the lack of context drawings, and that this made it difficult for the Commission and the applicants to see how the proposed project would fit in with other properties on the block. Commissioner Klaus suggested that, if the project now gets deferred, this would be worthwhile to address in the next version submitted, as well as consulting with neighbors about siting.

Mr. Montgomery stated that the house on the right of 517 Catherine Street has a one-story addition that is longer than the applicants' proposed addition. Mr. Montgomery stated that the two houses on the left are newer construction.

Mr. Montgomery stated that he understood Ms. Jones' point about the lot coverage on the houses behind the alley not being original but possibly older additions.

Mr. Montgomery stated that there are houses that have a configuration that utilizes significant lot space, right across the alley.

Commissioner Klaus stated that context drawings could work in the applicants' favor, if they can show that their proposed lot coverage is normal in the context of the area.

Mr. Montgomery stated that he had provided the map from a previous application, which shows clearly the additions on the opposite side of the alley, as well as the house next door, and that he could provide photographs of these, if that would be helpful. Mr. Montgomery asked if Commissioner Klaus was requesting a rear rendering of the property. Commission Chair Johnson stated that that seemed to be the case, and that the Commission needs clarification on a number of items. Ms. Jones pointed out that what was being requested by Commissioner Klaus is known as a context site plan. Mr. Montgomery stated that he has not generally done those for the rear of a property, but that he could do so.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Marie Cousins, resident of 511 Catherine Street and owner of both 509 and 511 Catherine Street, stated that the proposed 2-story addition appears obtrusive, and that there are other properties on Catherine Street which have additions, including 503, 511, and 519 Catherine Street, all of which are of one story.

Ms. Cousins stated, regarding the porch, that she and her neighbors have been charged with rehabilitating their front porches to be in line with the historic context of the neighborhood, and have done so at considerable cost without the benefit of a historic tax credit to make the work more affordable. Ms. Cousins stated that it would be nice if the applicant would consider doing the same thing, so that 517 Catherine Street would not look so out of place as it does.

Ms. Cousins stated that she is aware the Commission does not have purview over this, but that the property at 517 Catherine Street has deteriorated during the past year due to neglect, and it would be nice if it could be protected.

Ms. Diane Jeffries signaled an interest in commenting, but did not do so, possibly due to technical issues. Ms. Jones stated that Ms. Diane Jeffries had provided a comment letter, which had been distributed to the Commission members.

Stating that Ms. Diane Jeffries could speak later in the meeting if she wished to, Commission Chair Johnson closed public comment and opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to defer the application to give the applicant the opportunity to consider the following recommendations: if any physical evidence is revealed when the asphalt siding is removed which indicates the historic location of the façade windows, the location of the façade windows be based on this evidence; if there is no physical evidence of the historic window locations, staff recommends the windows be horizontally and vertically spaced to match the historic three-bay patterns found on the block; the applicant update the elevations to show a 6/6 window on the second story and a 2/2 window on the first story of the façade; if wood siding is found, it be consolidated on the front of the building and new wood siding that matches the historic siding be installed on the secondary elevations; the applicant submit revised plans that accurately reflect the historic roof slope and use a metal roof; the applicant lower the roof of the addition to maintain the historic roof slope, and reduce either the height or the length of the addition; the siding for the proposed addition have a different reveal from the siding on the historic building; the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the proposed fence; the applicant submit a context site plan; and the applicant consider reinstating the historic porch.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she was not clear on the reasoning for the window configuration recommendations, for 6/6 on the second story and 2/2 on the first story, as this had not been her impression from looking at the historic photos. Ms. Jones stated that the recommendations were based on photographic evidence, included in the presentation, which staff believed indicated 6/6 and 2/2 windows in the locations specified. Ms. Jones stated that she could send Commissioners the source photo as a stand-alone file, which might be clearer.

Commissioner Wheeler pointed out that the windows are not currently there, and suggested that, if possible, the Commission push for the front porch to be restored, if at all possible.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the neighboring house to the right has its historic windows, which include longer, typical first floor porch windows, and suggested that windows in this style be included as a condition of approval for this application. Commissioner Morgan stated that she prefer there be a front porch, but that if the porch cannot be restored, that at least the typical front windows being present would be a gesture that the porch had been there.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the addition on the left side seems to begin where there is a window opening, and stated that there should be a delineation between the existing porch enclosure and addition and window.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the Guidelines support the staff's recommendation for the roof line of the addition to be kept below the cornice of the rear elevation.

Commissioner Morgan stated that there is a substantial enough quantity of changes to the drawings that staff might not feel comfortable being responsible for administratively approving them.

Commissioner Klaus stated that, since the motion was for deferral, all of these matters would be coming back before the Commission at a later meeting.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he hoped the Commission discussion would be helpful to the applicant in terms of formulating a new application. Items to address would include providing greater detail, checking in with neighbors for contextual information, and providing better definition between the addition, the old house, and the roof line.

Regarding the porch, Commission Chair Johnson asked if any Commissioners felt strongly about it, and stated that since there is not a porch currently in existence, it is not typical for the Commission to require a non-existent porch be rebuilt.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was information about when the porch was removed. Ms. Jones stated that she could check the photo evidence and see if that information exists in some other records, but that she believes that the porch was already gone at the time the house was added to the National Register of Historic Places.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the restoration of the porch would make the project more popular with neighbors, and thus might help to move it along.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he would encourage the applicants to show the proposed parking and any proposed fence line. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the lack of a front porch makes it seem as if it is on a side street such as Henry Street or Monroe Street, the perpendicular streets that tend to have houses without porches, as opposed to Clay or Marshall Streets, where the houses generally do have porches.

Commissioner Morgan stated that, though there is not a porch, there is a front stoop-like overhang, and there are single-bay porches on the street as well, so at a minimum maintaining that would be expected.

Ms. Diane Jeffries had at this point rejoined the meeting and signaled a wish to comment, but again did not, apparently due to technical difficulties.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to defer the application to give the applicant the opportunity to consider the following recommendations: if any physical evidence is revealed when the asphalt siding is removed which indicates the historic location of the façade windows, the location of the façade windows be based on this evidence; if there is no physical evidence of the historic window locations, staff recommends the windows be horizontally and vertically spaced to match the historic three-bay patterns found on the block; the applicant update the elevations to show a 6/6 window on the second story and a 2/2 window on the first story of the façade; if wood siding is found, it be consolidated on the front of the building and new wood siding that matches the historic siding be installed on the secondary elevations; the applicant submit revised plans that accurately reflect the historic roof slope and use a metal roof; the applicant lower the roof of the addition to maintain the historic roof slope, and reduce either the height or the length of the addition; the siding for the proposed addition have a different reveal from the siding on the historic building; the applicant submit a site plan showing the location of the proposed fence; the applicant submit a context site plan; and the applicant consider reinstating the historic porch.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

10. [COA-079725-2020](#) 2010-2012 Venable Street - Rehabilitate two, two-story attached residences, and construct a rear addition.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

The applicant representative, Matt Jarreau, stated that the applicants would have no objection to having the whole building painted the same body color and the same trim color, but that the owner was reluctant to agree to also have the neighboring addresses at 2006, 2008, etc. be all one color. Ms. Jeffries stated that this was not the intent of the recommendation, and that the intention was to recommend that the two addresses named in the application, 2010 and 2012 Venable, be painted one color, and that the two neighboring units, 2006 and 2008, also be in color.

Mr. Jarreau stated that it appeared the applicants had made errors in the floor plans, with the façades, and that they could get the requested changes back to Commission staff in the next week or so.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the staff's roof line recommendations presented any problems for the applicants. Mr. Jarreau stated that the owner was unfortunately not present on the line for this meeting, but that he suspected the owner would have an issue with the roof line recommendations. Commission Chair Johnson recommended that Mr. Jarreau share with the owner that the Commission does like to work with applicants, but that differentiating the roof line of the addition is considered very important by the Commission.

Mr. Jarreau suggested that the use of synthetic hardi-plank on the new structure might be sufficient to differentiate the new construction from the old, which would be wood. Commission Chair Johnson stated that the issue being discussed is the roof line.

Mr. Jarreau referred to Google Street View, and stated that the addition would not really be visible to a person going down Venable Street, and that a person would have to be in the side yard or in the alley to see the addition, and that a viewer would then be on the other side of the parking lot, and thus at least 40 feet away from the back of the building.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: any replacement of the cornice elements be done in-kind with wood to match the existing design and profile; one paint color be used for the entire building and be submitted to staff for administrative approval; any existing box gutters be retained and repaired, and specifications for any new gutters be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the replacement railing be a hand-sawn design, to match the historic photograph; the second story façade windows at 2010 Venable Street be replaced with 2/2 wood or aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and spacer bars between the glass; the applicant submit a

detailed window survey and work with staff for an administrative approval of window repairs, or replacement; the front doors be retained, if they are beyond repair, the new doors match the existing design; the exterior portions of the chimneys be retained and the plans be revised to include the chimneys, prior to the issuance of a building permit; the existing windows in the outer bays on the first story on the rear elevation be retained on each house; the fiber cement siding on the addition be smooth and unbeaded; the roof of the addition be placed below the existing roofline, to differentiate the new construction from the existing building; the windows on the second story rear elevation of the existing massing be removed; the windows on the addition be of a contemporary design, differentiated from the historic windows; and the following information be submitted for administrative approval: paint colors; roof and gutter specifications; window specifications; door specifications; site plan showing location of HVAC; revised plans.

Commissioner Morgan reiterated that addition roofs are typically required to be constructed below the historic roof line.

Commissioner Morgan suggested to Mr. Montgomery, the applicant for 517 Catherine Street that this application for an addition is a good example to follow, in terms of the clear site plan and dimensions information provided.

Commissioner Klaus pointed out the good catch on the part of staff, identifying that the doors are quite old and look as if they may be original, and that it would be a shame not to restore them, if at all possible.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: any replacement of the cornice elements be done in-kind with wood to match the existing design and profile; one paint color be used for the entire building and be submitted to staff for administrative approval; any existing box gutters be retained and repaired, and specifications for any new gutters be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the replacement railing be a hand-sawn design, to match the historic photograph; the second story façade windows at 2010 Venable Street be replaced with 2/2 wood or aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and spacer bars between the glass; the applicant submit a detailed window survey and work with staff for an administrative approval of window repairs, or replacement; the front doors be retained, if they are beyond repair, the new doors match the existing design; the exterior portions of the chimneys be retained and the plans be revised to include the chimneys, prior to the issuance of a building permit; the existing windows in the outer bays on the first story on the rear elevation be retained on each house; the fiber cement siding on the addition be smooth and unbeaded; the roof of the addition be placed below the existing roofline, to differentiate the new construction from the existing building; the windows on the second story rear elevation of the existing massing be removed; the windows on the addition be of a contemporary design, differentiated from the historic windows; and the following information be submitted for administrative approval: paint colors; roof and gutter specifications; window specifications; door specifications; site plan showing location of HVAC; revised plans.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

11. [COA-079739-2020](#) 2006-2008 Venable Street - Rehabilitate two, two-story attached residences, and construct a rear deck.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Mr. Chris Pollock introduced himself and his partner, Kurt Yartz, as applicants for the project.

Mr. Pollock apologized for starting work before receiving authorization, and stated that work on the project had stopped.

Mr. Pollock stated that everything that had been removed from the existing building was deteriorated and that nothing that was in question had been touched. Mr. Pollock stated that the doors and all the first floor windows were completely intact.

Mr. Pollock asked whether, if the applicants were able to situate the HVAC equipment the roof in such a way that it was not visible from either Mosby or Venable Street, this roof placement could be allowed. Commission Chair Johnson stated that typically this could be allowed, and that it would have to be submitted for administrative approval.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: any replacement of the cornice elements be done in-kind with wood to match the existing design and profile; the wood siding be consolidated on the façade and if any additional siding is needed it be wood siding with a reveal to match the historic reveal; the fiber cement siding on the rear of the building be smooth and unbeaded; one paint color be used for the entire building and be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the front porch roof be replaced with TPO in a dark color; any existing box gutters be retained and repaired and specifications for any new gutters be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the composite decking be tongue-and-groove and be installed perpendicular to the façade; the replacement railing be a hand-sawn design to match the historic photograph, and revised drawings be submitted for administrative approval; the second story façade windows fit within the historic openings and be replaced with 2/2 wood or aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and spacer bars between the glass; the first story façade windows be retained and repaired; the front doors be retained, if they are beyond repair, evidence be submitted to staff and the new doors match the existing design; the windows replacing the door openings on the rear elevation be of a contemporary design, rather than the 2/2 proposed; the new kitchen windows on the rear elevation fit between the existing door jambs; the exterior portions of the chimneys be retained and the plans be revised to include the chimneys prior to the issuance of a building permit; the HVAC equipment be installed in the rear yard; the deck be painted or stained a neutral color, and the deck railing be Richmond rail, or the pickets be attached on the interior of the railing, for a more finished appearance; and the following information be submitted for

administrative approval: paint colors; roof and gutter specifications; composite decking specifications; window specifications; door specifications; fence specifications; revised plans.

Commissioner Klaus stated that staff had recommended not using Richmond rail, and instead to try to recreate a cut board, patterned balustrade system. Commissioner Klaus pointed out that this staff recommendation was based on photographic evidence, and that the installation of this kind of rail would constitute a great addition to the house and to the neighborhood. Commissioner Klaus stated that there may be useful examples of this kind of rail in the neighborhood which the applicants could use as a model, and which staff could point out to the applicant. Ms. Jones stated that she would be glad to assist the applicant with this.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he hoped the applicant had noted the recommendation to differentiate the paint scheme with the neighbor.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: any replacement of the cornice elements be done in-kind with wood to match the existing design and profile; the wood siding be consolidated on the façade and if any additional siding is needed it be wood siding with a reveal to match the historic reveal; the fiber cement siding on the rear of the building be smooth and unbeaded; one paint color be used for the entire building and be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the front porch roof be replaced with TPO in a dark color; any existing box gutters be retained and repaired and specifications for any new gutters be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the composite decking be tongue-and-groove and be installed perpendicular to the façade; the replacement railing be a hand-sawn design to match the historic photograph, and revised drawings be submitted for administrative approval; the second story façade windows fit within the historic openings and be replaced with 2/2 wood or aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and spacer bars between the glass; the first story façade windows be retained and repaired; the front doors be retained, if they are beyond repair, evidence be submitted to staff and the new doors match the existing design; the windows replacing the door openings on the rear elevation be of a contemporary design, rather than the 2/2 proposed; the new kitchen windows on the rear elevation fit between the existing door jambs; the exterior portions of the chimneys be retained and the plans be revised to include the chimneys prior to the issuance of a building permit; the HVAC equipment be installed in the rear yard; the deck be painted or stained a neutral color, and the deck railing be Richmond rail, or the pickets be attached on the interior of the railing, for a more finished appearance; and the following information be submitted for administrative approval: paint colors; roof and gutter specifications; composite decking specifications; window specifications; door specifications; fence specifications; revised plans.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

13. [COA-080423-2020](#) 715 Mosby Street - Construct a new, three-story, 15 unit, multi-family building.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Mr. Sam Tuttle, stated that the applicants are generally in agreement with staff comments.

Ms. Emily Lacroix, project architect, stated that many changes were made in response to the Commission's prior comments. Ms. Lacroix stated that the applicants would be happy to work with staff regarding an alternate material to the metal panels as long as the material choice, as opposed to a contrast in materials, is the issue.

Ms. Lacroix stated that parging the CMU seems straightforward, and that the applicants can work with the HVAC screening. Ms. Lacroix stated that a civil engineer has been engaged to work on grading and that diagrams can be provided to respond to staff concerns about grading. Ms. Lacroix stated that the applicants had done several grading studies to determine how the parking and accessible routes from the rear of the property would work, while balancing this with getting the first floor levels the necessary height off the sidewalk.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Nancy Lampert introduced herself and stated that projects such as this three-story building are gradually destroying the historic character of the neighborhood, and that this could ultimately endanger the historic status of the district.

Mr. Jarreau stated that he was excited about this infill project and what it will contribute to the community, and that he feels it will fit in well with the area.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any additional public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant work with staff to find a more appropriate exterior material than the vertical metal panels; the foundation be parged; all final material and color specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval; the applicant add additional screening for the rooftop HVAC; the applicant provide additional information about any regrading activities and provide additional details about the final parking lot screening for review.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that a sight line study might be a way to resolve the screening question, without adding additional screening.

Ms. Lacroix stated that the applicants would be happy to do a sight line study showing the views from Mosby. Ms. Lacroix stated that it sounds as if the concern might be the view from 21st Street or the public alley, and that the applicants will need to get more information about the grading at 21st Street, which is considerably higher than the project

site.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the underside of the decks should have a finish and not simply be exposed to the deck structure.

Commissioner Morgan suggested that staff comments about grading can be taken to mean that the existing level of grade should be maintained, and that it should not increase the height.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she was initially concerned about the height on 21st Street, where the grade is significantly higher and the buildings are two stories with a raised basement. Ms. Morgan stated that she thinks this project is not a tremendous reach, in terms of height, for the area.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that if the return around the corner could change in depth, that would be better, instead of just changing material within the same plane, and that it would be even better, if the applicants want to keep it in the same plane, if the return went all the way back to the rear of the building.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant work with staff to find a more appropriate exterior material than the vertical metal panels; the foundation be parged; all final material and color specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval; the applicant add additional screening for the rooftop HVAC; the applicant provide additional information about any regrading activities and provide additional details about the final parking lot screening for review.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

Recused -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

14. [COA-079732-2020](#) 713 N. 24th Street - Construct a new two-story, single-family detached residence.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Mr. Sean Stilwell, stated that the project architect's intent, regarding building alignment, had been to anticipate Zoning requirements. Mr. Stilwell stated that Zoning staff typically wants the setback to be averaged between two properties. Mr. Stilwell that the applicants would be happy to push the house forward if that is allowed by Zoning, as this would allow for a larger yard.

Mr. Stilwell stated that he is okay with switching to a shed roof, and asked if a black TPO material could be allowed, rather than metal, given that the roof will not be visible.

Mr. Stilwell stated that one of the builders had recommended reducing the width of the porch, in order to better fit the gutters, and had stated that given the narrowness of the house, a shed roof might be more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Stilwell stated, regarding the window recommendations for the front bedroom, that the applicants might put one regular size window in place of the current two small windows, or potentially eliminate the window. Mr. Stilwell asked if the window recommendation was for the first only, or for both.

Mr. Stilwell stated that his intent with this project is not to build a large or incongruous house, and that a smaller house seemed to make more sense with the lot size.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he had no additions to the staff comments, and that they had done a great job. Commissioner Klaus stated that as of about five years ago there had been a twin house from 1860 at the site, and suggested that some modern allusion to the 1860s era of that and most area houses might improve the project.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she prefers minimal implementation of detailing that is not of our time; therefore she would recommend eliminating the cornice details. Commissioner Morgan also suggested that historic siting be considered in the siting of this modern construction, and that in this area there are many double houses that are situated on one side of their lot as opposed to the other, whereas the applicants are proposing to have two side yards. Commissioner Morgan stated that having a historic precedent for the siting could be useful in the event that a zoning variance must be applied for, to allow the proposed setbacks. Commissioner Morgan stated that, as the applicant said, the proposed setbacks do create a narrow building. Commissioner Morgan suggested that the side yard setbacks be minimized.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed agreement with staff comments. Among things to consider for a revised application, Commissioner Wheeler recommended that privacy fencing be considered, and stated that there is not much of a back deck, whereas in modern times people generally have larger back decks. Commissioner Wheeler suggested that the deck could be larger and the back door could be covered.

The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.

15. [COA-079734-2020](#) 2325 Venable Street - Construct a new two-story, single-family detached residence.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Mr. Mario DiMarco stated that the project is similar to another one nearby on Pink Street being built by the same developer, and that it would not be the only wood frame building on the block, so he did not feel it to be out of character, merely in the minority. Mr. DiMarco stated that the applicants would if at all possible prefer that the building not be brick.

Mr. DiMarco stated that the developer had wanted to install a rooftop deck, but the owner was not sure if he wanted to commit to that; there is uncertainty about what else will be on the roof, and closing off roof access altogether was also being considered.

Mr. DiMarco stated that the inaccurate window information on the drawings would easily be corrected.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Nancy Lampert suggested that, if a roof deck is installed, it be flipped from its current proposed location and placed instead on the east side of the building, so that it would be more of a step-down from the Church Hill house, tapering from the four-story building on Pink Street to the two-story townhouses.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any further public comment. There was none.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he liked the idea of a roof terrace to provide outdoor space for residents, especially with the massing step-down as suggested by Ms. Lampert, and in light of current conditions forcing people to be stuck in their homes. Commissioner Wheeler suggested adding parapets to the sides, and stated that these could serve as screens for the guardrails, or the parapets themselves could potentially become guardrails.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he did not mind the proposed building being wood frame construction, as long as it reads as new construction. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the two-story porch is interesting and may not be necessary if there is a roof terrace.

Commissioner Morgan expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler, adding that she is in favor of minimizing a design that mimics historic ornamentation, such as modillion or bracketed cornices, and that she would recommend 1/1 windows as opposed to 2/2 windows.

Commissioner Morgan stated that a more modern design would more easily lend itself to adding parapets. Commissioner Morgan stated that placing side yards on each side of the house should be avoided in an area such as this where they are not historically found.

Commissioner Klaus pointed out that all four corner buildings at the project location are sited to the street and are former commercial buildings. Commissioner Klaus cited the example of a recently reviewed project at a corner lot on Venable Street, for which a commercial use was planned on the first floor, as an example of a project that successfully referenced the fact that these corner lots did not typically have single-family houses, centered on their lots, with two side yards. Commissioner Klaus suggested that the applicants attempt a similar siting to these other buildings, although if in fact Zoning staff does not allow the applicants to go to the lot line, it would be a moot point.

Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement with Commissioner Morgan regarding the side yards, and encouraged the applicant to opt for a modern design and eliminate the setbacks, thus being more sensitive to the historic usage of the corner lots in this area. Commissioner Klaus asked Ms. Jones to forward to Mr. DiMarco information about another corner property that was recently reviewed and approved.

Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Klaus, adding that the corner lot presents an opportunity to do something creative. Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler's comments regarding the rooftop and the back porch, and the suggestion to add rooftop parapets.

Commissioner Klaus clarified that while advocating for the building to go to the lot line, he is not insisting that the property be mixed-use, or that it cannot be a single-family house.

Ms. Jones stated that she would be happy to provide the information referred to by Commissioner Klaus, and to get additional information from Zoning staff about the R-63 zoning designation and what it allows.

Commissioner Wheeler pointed out that there are guidelines regarding residential corner lots, including such matters as details wrapping around the corner.

The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.

16. [COA-079731-2020](#) 605 N. 21st Street - Construct a rear, two-story, accessory dwelling unit.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

The applicant, Ms. Sarah Blackburn, stated that the applicants would be happy to address the issues staff mentioned regarding windows and conforming to the Guidelines. Ms. Blackburn stated that the issue of height had been taken into consideration by the applicants. Ms. Blackburn stated that the lot slopes upward from south to north and the proposed building is seated at the highest point in the lot, which makes it higher than if it were on the other side of the lot. Ms. Blackburn stated that the applicants had considered siting the building on the other side of the lot, but that this would have made it visible from 21st Street, whereas in its current proposed location it is only visible from M Street and the alley.

Ms. Blackburn stated that the applicants proposed a shed style roof and not a gable roof in order to reduce the overall height. Ms. Blackburn stated that the ceiling heights are not particularly generous, so there is not a lot of leeway, but that Commission suggestions on how to further limit the height would be welcome.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Commissioner Pearson asked for the proposed square footage of the building. Ms. Blackburn stated that she did not know it, though she might be able to look it up.

Commissioner Johnson stated that height would probably be the biggest issue, because secondary buildings need to be subordinate to the primary structure. Commissioner Johnson stated that it would be challenging to reduce the scale and massing of the proposed building, without getting rid of the second story and thus losing the room above the garage.

Commissioner Morgan expressed appreciation that the applicant took visibility into account in the siting of the building, and stated that this helps somewhat with the height issue. Commissioner Morgan stated that otherwise the proposed design was fine.

Commissioner Klaus stated that applicants are often able to shave a couple feet off the height and receive approval and still have essentially what they want.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that there is precedent for two-story outbuildings in the area, so he is leaning toward acceptance of the height; but also suggested the possibility of building equivalent square footage into a one-story building. This latter option would require a larger footprint than that of the primary structure. Of those two options, the two-story one seems better.

Ms. Blackburn stated that a single floor of the proposed building would be approximately just under 500 square feet.

Commissioner Pearson stated that the height is right on the line but could be acceptable, but that combined with the footprint and the overall massing it potentially overwhelms the primary structure and thus becomes problematic. Commissioner Pearson suggested that the applicants either marginally reduce the height, or reduce the footprint, and stated that otherwise the project is headed in the right direction.

Ms. Blackburn asked if it would be preferable to reduce overall height but perhaps increase visibility by moving it to the other side of the lot, or to maintain the current siting but reduce the height by a few inches.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he is in favor of the siting away from the corner, but that the grade and the massing are problematic. Commission Chair Johnson pointed out that some Commissioners expressed less concern about these matters.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that less visibility of the building is good, and that this gives some relief from the two-story building next door which is fronting the street. Ms. Blackburn stated that that the north end of the lot has the advantage of being further from neighbors.

The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.

17. [COA-079736-2020](#) 304 N. 21st Street - Construct ten, three-story town houses.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(10/27/2020\)](#)[Base Map](#)[Staff Report \(10/27/2020\)](#)[Application and Plans](#)[Staff Report](#)

Commissioner Morgan stated that she would recuse herself from review of this project.

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Mimi Sadler of Sadler & Whitehead introduced herself and stated that the firm is providing historic preservation consultation for the project. Ms. Sadler stated that they were working with City staff and anticipated also working with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources during the tax credit application process.

Ms. Sadler mentioned that the owner Zac Frederick and architect Heather Grutzus were also present on the call and could respond to any questions.

Ms. Sadler stated that the applicants had met with Land Use and Zoning staff and that this had so far been positive and productive.

Ms. Sadler stated that the applicants would like to include a porch in the design, probably a recessed entry porch. Ms. Sadler stated that this type of porch treatment is uncommon for the historic district, but not unprecedented. Ms. Sadler stated that the applicants had found four examples. Ms. Sadler stated that the lot is too narrow to set back the houses to have front porches like those seen further north on the block.

Regarding staff's suggestion that applicants carefully consider the treatment of the south elevation, Ms. Sadler stated that the applicants recognize its importance, as it faces Broad Street, and would be happy to develop it carefully.

Ms. Sadler stated that the Shockoe Valley District has a wide variety of uses and scales of buildings, including many commercial as well as residential buildings, and that these sometimes include buildings, including residential ones, which go all the way to the lot line. Ms. Sadler stated that the Sanborn map indicates that this property has historically had commercial/industrial use, with buildings that go to the lot line. Ms. Sadler referenced a 1950 Sanborn map included in the application, which shows the historic building going to the edge of the lot at the side and rear.

Ms. Sadler cited an example the applicants had found of residential buildings that go to the lot line and has recessed porches.

Ms. Sadler stated that the scale, nature, and height of the proposed buildings has been carefully considered as to compatibility with the area and its historic development.

Ms. Sadler stated that the owner intends to apply for the rehabilitation tax credits for the rehabilitation of the historic building, to be developed for mixed use, primarily residential with a small commercial component. Ms. Sadler stated that the owner could consider additional townhouses closer to Broad Street, but that this would be subject to negotiation with the tax credit reviewers as well as the CAR.

Ms. Sadler stated that a townhouse use on the east side of the block is compatible with the area and consistent with patterns of use on the site.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Heather Grutizus, the project architect, stated that the houses being proposed are at a comfortable distance from the historic building in order to let it stand on its own.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any further public comment. There was none. Ms. Jones pointed out that two public comment letters had been received.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the primary street for the property is Broad Street, and that he would expect the project to front on Broad Street and not on 21st Street, or at least to address Broad Street in some way other than a parking lot. Ms. Sadler stated that the applicants knew that they would not be able to place new construction in front of the historic garage building, and that the owner is very interested in bringing new townhouse development closer to Broad Street, to the extent that DHR will allow it.

Commissioner Wheeler pointed out that the garage must have historically had some other building in front of it.

Ms. Sadler stated that the garage was not behind anything, and referred to a 1950 Sanborn map showing the historic location of a garage with a brick addition on the front, which was built in 1925. Ms. Sadler stated that due its use as a lumberyard and later for automotive repair, the garage had had copious empty space in front of it.

Ms. Sadler pointed out various parts of the garage, including a section which was previously authorized for demolition, pointed out that historically there had been much empty land behind it, and stated that the proposed density seemed appropriate for this area.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the meeting was becoming too much of a conversation, and asked that Commissioners not phrase their statements as questions.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the lot in question is strange and challenging, that there had been many prior usages of the lot and the area, and thus different interpretations could be made depending on which Sanborn map one chooses to refer to. Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler in terms of siting, stating that if the use of the site is constrained by historic tax credit requirements as Ms. Sadler is stating, this will create challenges in terms of coming up with a design that works while not blocking the garage. Commissioner Klaus stated that seeing the minimal white box representation in the plans, he found it difficult to state a clear "yes" or "no" to the project. Commissioner Klaus stated that he hoped there was some way to address the corner without blocking the garage and thus ruining eligibility for the historic tax credit.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that the corner be occupied.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that if the current siting is required by the historic tax credit process, this should be stated and addressed in the next application, and that, if it were possible to locate at least some of the buildings fronting on Broad Street, this would be helpful. Commissioner Johnson stated that, if the tax credit reviewers require the townhouses to be sited fronting on 21st Street, the applicant should explain this requirement from the DHR perspective and then explain what they intend to do in response.

The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity.

A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.

18. [COA-079735-2020](#) 910-912 N. 25th Street - Construct two, three-story, semi-attached residences.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Commissioner Pearson recused himself from review of this project, and left the meeting at this juncture, at 6:57 PM.

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Mr. Greg Shron of Center Creek Homes, stated that he would appreciate Commission feedback on building height, and any stylistic or other changes that could facilitate keeping the proposed height. Mr. Shron expressed awareness that the proposed building is tall for the area, though it is zoned R-63 which allows for greater density, and it is located on the boundary of the historic district. Mr. Shron stated that the buildings across the street are not in the district and at this point, unfortunately, consist of a low, 1970s era, somewhat unattractive commercial building.

Mr. Shron stated that the applicants had attempted to provide as livable a space as possible by designing a 3-story structure with the 3rd story section at the front and an outdoor rooftop amenity at the rear, where it is adjacent to a quieter more residential area. Mr. Shron acknowledged that this design is somewhat unusual for the area.

Mr. Shron stated that the applicants would like to keep the proposed height if at all possible, and to avoid having to stretch the floor plan to the rear and thus encroach on backyard and parking space.

Mr. Shron stated that, being mindful of past Commission feedback, the applicants have attempted to present a more streamlined and contemporary version of a row house.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Lampert stated that the 3-story building proposed is part of the "slippery slope" of transformation of this district, and pointed out that one nearby house is only one story, and another is a small cottage.

Commissioner Morgan expressed agreement with staff recommendations and their finding that the height should be reduced, especially since it is a raised lot in the middle of the block, and stated that the proposed construction needs to be more comparable to the neighboring buildings. Commissioner Morgan expressed doubt, however, about the alternative option of making the house longer.

Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement that the height is excessive, and pointed out that in some cases building plans have been reversed, with outdoor spaces in the front and third floor structures in the rear, so that observers from the street cannot see that it is a three-story building. Commissioner Klaus stated that this might possibly be a solution here, although care would have to be taken that it did not look as if there was a deck at the third-floor level.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the three stories proposed are difficult, not only within a historic but also within the general context. Commissioner Wheeler suggested that a possible solution might be found by referring to what the applicant already did with a property on Jackson Street, an example of the option referred to by Commissioner Klaus; or, alternatively, an English Basement design, which would provide three stories with half of the first story being underground. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the modern aesthetic of the design is effective, and that the height is the only potential obstacle.

Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement that the height is the main issue, suggested looking at past projects that have effectively dealt with this, and stated that the English Basement idea could be workable.

The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:11 PM.