



Meeting Minutes
Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, May 25, 2021

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, May 25, 2021 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES 2021.126](#) Public Access and Participation - Commission of Architectural Review

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

Call to Order

Commission Chair Neville Johnson called the May, 2020 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:32 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.

Commission Chair Neville Johnson provided an overview of the meeting sequence and protocol.

Roll Call

- Present --** 8 - * Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., * Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, * Commissioner Sean Wheeler, * Commissioner Lawrence Pearson, * Commissioner Mitch Danese, * Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, * Commissioner Andrew Moore and * Commissioner James W. Klaus
- Excused --** 1 - * Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Approval of Minutes

April 27, 2021

Secretary's Report

Ms. Carey Jones stated that the current meeting would be her last as Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review, and that she would be happy to answer any questions relating to that.

Mr. Kevin Vonck, Acting Director of Planning and Development Review, expressed gratitude to Ms. Jones for her service for the Commission Secretary and for the department.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he echoed Mr. Vonck's words, and that the Commission greatly appreciates the work she has put in.

Administrative Approval Report

Commission Chair Johnson asked if Commissioners had any questions regarding the report. There were none.

Ms. Jones stated that as part of the transition underway, Ms. Emily Routman, a contracted employee with the department, would be helping to prepare and distribute the administrative approval reports.

Ms. Jones stated that permit review tasks have been distributed among some staff members as well.

Enforcements

Ms. Jones stated that the VUU enforcement case involving signage has been before the Planning Commission, so it is working its way through the process.

Commission Chair Johnson adjourned the business portion of the meeting at 3:40 PM.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

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

Ms. Jones also stated that there were some technical issues with the meeting link and that it could be obtained by emailing Ms. Jones.

Commission Chair Johnson explained that the meeting starts with the Consent Agenda, which staff believes can be passed without further discussion, followed by the Regular Agenda, and concluding with the Conceptual Review. Applications are presented by staff, and at appropriate times, applicants will have an opportunity to speak in regard to their applications. Commission Chair Johnson asked that members of the public strive not to repeat points that have already been raised.

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 Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to move the 10th item, 2501 E Franklin St, to the Consent Agenda.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. There was none. Ms. Joyce Miller, the applicant for item 10, asked for an explanation of what her application being on the consent agenda meant. Commission Chair Johnson explained that this meant it would be approved with the conditions recommended by staff.

Ms. Miller stated that she moved to her condo in 2019 and that during the intervening pandemic it has become more noticeable that the unit has two windows, neither of which are operable. Ms. Miller stated that the building had been renovated from business usage to condos.

Commissioner Wheeler withdrew the motion to move item 10 to the Consent Agenda.

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

Commissioner Klaus stated that the problem was that the applicant wished to install a conventional operable sash window, which would be readily identifiable as such from the exterior; if the applicant could find a window design that swings in and still looks like a door or fixed pane from the outside, Chairman Klaus stated that he did not think anyone would object to such a solution.

Ms. Miller stated that her contractor had suggested a sort of casement window that matched this description.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to move the 10th item, 2501 E Franklin St, to the Consent Agenda, as submitted with the condition that the replacement operable window opens in, with final design to be approved by staff.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Coleen Butler Rodriguez, Commission Chair Johnson, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Sean Wheeler
Excused – 1 – Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Commissioner Danese asked for clarification regarding item 6, 3225 Monument Avenue, as to whether conditions would include denial of what the applicant had put in originally.

Ms. Jones responded that for the 3225 Monument Avenue application the staff were recommending approval of the replacement of the majority of the non-historic windows,

and for the one identified historic window, recommending the installation of a storm window.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to move the 8th item, Monument Avenue, various locations, to the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Pearson stated that, unlike the two other monuments-related applications on the agenda, this one had not received much in the way of public comment.

Commissioner Klaus requested that an additional condition be added, to the effect that the monuments are to be stored and retained by the City until such time as the Monument Avenue Commission, which is being run by the Virginia Museum of Fine Art, has concluded its recommendation for Monument Avenue.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the Monument Avenue Commission is currently running an international competition for proposals to creatively reimagine the monument sites on Monument Avenue, and that not having the monument components such as pedestals at the architects' disposal would prevent creative reuse and thus place a limitation on their options, and be a waste of millions of dollars.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he realized it might be several years before a redesign of monument sites along Monument Avenue can be realized.

Commissioners Pearson stated that he had no objection to the amendment to the motion, but that he was not certain how enforceable it would be. Commissioner Rodriguez agreed to the amendment, stating that it is important to have on the record the Commission sentiment that keeping the reuse option open is worthwhile.

Commissioner Danese suggested the motion wording be amended to include the condition that the monuments be stored in a secure area. Commissioner Danese stated that this would not be enforceable, but that he would like it to be on the record.

Ms. Jones pointed out that one of the conditions recommended by staff is that the artifacts be stored in a secure environment before final disposition. Commissioner Danese stated that as long as that condition is not changed in the motion text, that would be fine. Commission Chair Johnson stated that it would not be.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed concern about erasing the median at the Stonewall location, as it would tend to limit future uses of that area. Commissioner stated that he sees this location as a primary entry-way to the City.

Mr. Vonck stated that the inclusion in the motion of a condition for safe and secure storage would be appropriate, but that he was not sure if the applicant would be amenable to a timetable for disposition of the artifacts, nor whether that would be an appropriate requirement for the Commission of Architectural Review to make.

Mr. Vonck stated that the application is a peculiar one as the applicant is a City entity, and that if necessary he could go into further detail about the decision-making process for disposition of artifacts, and how the action ultimately taken may be different from what is determined by CAR.

Mr. Rodney Poole, chair of the City Planning Commission, stated that in the City ordinance, there were different denominations and different processes for the monuments and their bases.

Mr. Poole stated that part of the first step of the process would be determining which bodies, if any, that have expressed interest in the monuments, would be considered acceptable recipients by the City Council.

Mr. Poole stated that most, if not all, of the groups that have expressed interest in taking the monuments have also expressed a desire to take the bases.

Mr. Poole stated that he had no objection to the storage of the bases, nor with this matter being voted on the Consent Agenda, but that he was concerned about the distinction between the two sets of processes.

Mr. Poole stated that the motion as stated would require that the artifacts remain in storage until the Monument Avenue Commission reaches a decision about their plans for Monument Avenue; Mr. Poole stated that such a decision would be a completely separate step.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there were any public comments on moving the 8th item to the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Paul DiPasquale introduced himself as a consultant for the City on phase 2 of the project currently under review, regarding first the statues and then developing a process for removal of the bases. Mr. DiPasquale stated that he had met with Dr. Taylor, who is responsible for the Governor's heritage project, and that it is likely that, in the reimagining of Monument Avenue within the heritage project there would be a suggestion to repurpose the pedestals, and that it would be very expensive to reuse them on Monument Avenue after they are removed and placed in storage. Mr. DiPasquale stated that there are precedents throughout the world for repurposing of monument pedestals. Mr. DiPasquale stated that both Dr. Taylor and himself are in favor of keeping the pedestals in place for five years to see what the heritage project and other citizens come up with in terms of alternate uses.

Ms. Catherine Briggs stated that she was involved with the Reimagining Monument Avenue group, which is a different group than the one associated with the VMFA, although the VMFA is also a member of the group with which Ms. Briggs is associated.

Ms. Briggs stated that her personal belief, not necessarily the stance of the group, was that the proposed removal of the pedestals is an attempt by the City of Richmond to erase the racism on Monument Avenue and beautify the city instead of addressing harms committed against communities in Richmond, and that the pedestals should be maintained where they are, to force an acknowledgement of what has happened so that the City can move forward as a community.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that it seemed as if there was a lot of discussion still to be had about this item, and asked Commissioners for feedback as to whether they would like to provide more time for discussion of this agenda item.

Commissioner Brewer stated that, based on the comments already heard, item 8 should be kept on the regular agenda. Commissioner Pearson suggested that the Commission vote on the motion, so as to dispose of it.

Mr. Vonck stated that the motion amendment calling for a several-year retention of artifacts may be beyond the remit and authority of CAR, and that he doubted whether a property owner can be required to keep or maintain property for a prescribed period of time. Mr. Vonck stated that there are two separate processes, one of which is for

permission for removal, and other separate processes involving when the objects will be removed, the manner of their removal, their ultimate locations, and the future reimagining of the sites once occupied by the objects.

Commissioner Klaus stated that there is no precedent for this case, and that for CAR, which is generally charged with retaining historic items, to instead be asked to dispose of some, creates a challenging situation. Commissioner Klaus stated that there is already an expensive commission in operation to reimagine Monument Avenue, and that getting rid of all the monuments and pedestals will unreasonably limit their resources. Commissioner Klaus stated that City Council can always overrule CAR's decision if it is determined to be unreasonable, and that it might be determined after the fact that CAR overstepped its remit by requiring the long-term retention of artifacts.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye – 1 - Commissioner Lane Pearson

No – 6 - Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Coleen Butler Rodriguez, Commission Chair Johnson, Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the amended Consent Agenda with staff conditions, and the amendment to the staff recommendation for item 10.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any comment from the applicants with items on the Consent Agenda.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment on the Consent Agenda. There was none.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he would abstain from voting due to a conflict of interest regarding item number 4.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the amended Consent Agenda with staff conditions, and the amendment to the staff recommendation for item 10.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler

1. [COA-091338-2021](#) 507 N. 27th Street - Construct a rear, one-story addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner

Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the siding be smooth and without a decorative bead and the colors be submitted to staff for review and approval; the new door opening fit within the height and width of the existing window; the building plans be updated prior to submitting for any permits.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

2. [COA-091348-2021](#) 18 N. Arthur Ashe Boulevard - Convert a rear, enclosed sunroom into a screened-in porch; alter fenestration and install an awning and balcony on a rear carriage house.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the screening on the second-story porch be placed inside the posts and railing, so the porch elements remain visible; the final window specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the brick infill be recessed to maintain the appearance of the current opening; to the greatest extent possible, the balcony be anchored into the mortar, not the historic brick; the awning be anchored into the mortar, not the historic masonry.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

3. [COA-091340-2021](#) 3820 Hermitage Road - Construct a rear shed.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the roof have a finish that more

closely resembles that of the main residence, to be reviewed and approved by staff; the wooden siding be smooth, without a bead.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

4. [COA-091734-2021](#) 419-421 Brook Road - Rehabilitate an existing building and construct a new rooftop addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

5. [COA-091770-2021](#) 128 W. Clay Street - Add a rooftop addition and deck to an existing two-story building.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

6. [COA-090017-2021](#) 3225 Monument Avenue - Replace eleven windows.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(04/27/2021\)](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report \(04/27/2021\)](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: window #201 be retained, and that the applicant consider the installation of an exterior or interior storm widow in this location to be reviewed and approved by staff.

The motion carried by the following vote:

10. [COA-091349-2021](#) 2501 E. Franklin Street - Replace two fixed windows with double-hung, divided light, wooden windows.

Attachments: [Applications and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the glass be replaced with an operable window, such as a casement windows, instead of a sash window that fills the opening completely.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

REGULAR AGENDA

Mr. Kevin Vonck, Acting Director of Planning, Development and Review, gave a presentation about the monuments under review in agenda items 7, 8, and 9, and the process for their review by the Commission of Architectural Review, the Urban Design Committee, and the City Planning Commission.

Mr. Vonck's presentation text:

What is a monument?

- A monument is an interconnected object, inclusive of all statuary, platforms, plinths, columns, and pedestals; this includes any statuary previously removed under emergency orders

What authorizes the removal of monuments?

- § 15.2-1812 Code of Virginia: a local governing body may remove, relocate, contextualize, or cover any war monument or memorial on public property it owns
- City Ordinance 2020-154: as required and pursuant to the authority granted by § 15.2

-1812 Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, and all other applicable law, and subject to the availability of funds, the Chief Administrative Officer is hereby authorized to cause the removal of the Monuments from their current locations

What is the City process?

- City Planning Commission (CPC): per § 17.05 City Charter, the CPC shall approve the removal, relocation, and alteration of monuments
- Urban Design Committee (UDC): per § 30-940.3(d) City Code, the UDC may advise the CPC on a Charter § 17.05 matter

• Commission of Architectural Review (CAR): Per ARTICLE IX, DIVISION 4 of City Code, CAR must first grant a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for relocation or removal of monuments located in City Old and Historic Districts

Commission of Architectural Review (CAR): Tuesday, 25th My @ 3:30 p.m. – Consideration of Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)

Urban Design Committee (UDC): Thursday, 10th June @ 10 a.m. – Consideration (recommendation) of final location, character, and extent (LCE)

City Planning Commission (CPC): Monday, 21st June @ 1:30 p.m. – Consideration (approval) of final location, character, and extent (LCE)

What does approval authorize?

Approval only authorizes:

- City's permanent removal of the monuments under the standards applicable to the reviewing body's review
- temporary restoration of each site necessary to maintain health, human safety, traffic flow, and landscape continuity

Approval does not authorize:

- if, when, and to what extent the monuments (or parts thereof) will be removed
- to whom the permanently removed monuments will be transferred
- where the permanently removed monuments will be located after their transfer
- if, how, or when each site will be improved in the future

Commission of Architectural Review (CAR): Per ARTICLE IX, DIVISION 4 of City Code, CAR must first grant a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for relocation or removal of monuments located in City Old and Historic Districts

Richmond City Council has the ultimate authority as to the removal and disposition of the monuments. The current review only gives approval for going forward with the removal.

7. [COA-091355-2021](#) 0 N. 29th Street - Remove a monument and pedestal.

Attachments: [Applications and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Mr. Chris Frelke, Director of Department of Parks, Recreation and Community Facilities, stated that the Department was supportive of staff recommendations for this project.

Commission Chair Johnson asked about what was planned for curbing, in light of earlier interest expressed by Commissioners in retaining or restoring it. Mr. Frelke stated that he would defer to staff from the Department of Public Works, also on the meeting call.

Mr. M. Khara of DPW stated that restoration of the cobblestone was planned, following the removal of the pedestal. Commission Chair Johnson asked for clarification as to

whether the circle would be kept, or whether this would be cobbled over to match the cobbles currently around the monument.

Mr. Khara stated that at this time the plan would be to remove the circle and restore the cobblestone in that area. Mr. Frelke stated that the curb in that area would also be retained.

Commissioner Pearson stated that public comments had suggested taking more time to evaluate the City's preferred course of action before taking any action on the monuments. Commissioner Pearson asked what sort of time-sensitive criteria the applicants are considering in terms of how quickly they come to a decision about the application.

Mr. Frelke stated that there were no timelines decided for removal as of yet, but that there would still be many steps before being able to do the removal, and applicants were eager to get the process started as soon as possible.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment, and requested that commenters identify themselves for the record and not repeat previously raised points.

Ms. Sarah Driggs stated that it would be premature to allow removal before having a plan in place, and that the priority is for the City to engage the public in an effort to solve the problems caused by the monuments. Ms. Driggs stated that this vote should be paused and that the City should be forced to do the hard work of having a discussion. Ms. Driggs stated that there had been a full year of meetings about Monument Avenue, without any action being taken.

Ms. Alli Alligood, president of Church Hill Association, stated that the Association had voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Soldiers and Sailors statue being removed and that they had expressed a wish to Council President Dr. Cynthia Newbille to be involved in the process of reimagining the site, for which there are numerous proposals.

Ms. Alligood stated that she felt there was a contradiction between the definition of a monument provided by Mr. Vonck, and his description of the removal application process, and that she would like to discuss this outside of the meeting context.

Ms. Alligood stated that she wished more time could be taken to imagine a new purpose for the column and base, as they are in a visible position and could beautify the City, and their removal will be costly and wasteful.

Mr. Stewart Schwartz introduced himself as a resident of Church Hill and President of the Partnership for Smarter Growth, which he said is supportive of the Church Hill Association letter and resolution which had been provided to the Commissioners. Mr. Schwartz stated that the remaining column and base, once the inscription is removed, will no longer be a confederate monument but will still be a striking and highly visible neighborhood feature and also a traffic-calming feature.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the view from Libby Hill Park where the subject pedestal is located provides a panoramic view of the City and of its history, both tragic and uplifting, including 402 years of history, the retaking of the city by African-American troops in 1865, and the Black Live Matter movement and large graffiti "TAKE IT DOWN" around the statue's base. Mr. Schwartz stated that this history should be taken into account when reimagining a use for this site, and suggested that a statue of Pocahontas, Abraham Lincoln, or a modern African American leader could be placed on the pedestal.

Mr. Schwartz stated that the only option being presented by the City was removal, and that no space was being provided to consider other options and capitalize on the creativity and artistic ability of Richmond's residents.

Ms. Mary Lorino, resident of 30th Street and Secretary of the Church Hill Association, stated that she was concerned about the rigid definition of monuments provided by Mr. Vonck, and that this definition was being used as a reason to remove a beautiful object which has meaning for Church Hill residents. Ms. Lorino stated that the monument now has new meanings relating to civil rights and all that has happened, and that its removal would be heartbreaking and a rewriting of history. Ms. Lorino stated that the pandemic had prevented community involvement in decision-making about the monuments.

Ms. Hannah Zaino of Church Hill Association, stated that the existing column and base has significance for community members as a landmark and meeting point, and that the community should be involved in repurposing that monument and the space. Ms. Zaino suggested the funds for removal could be better used for beautifying the neighborhood and benefiting the community.

Mr. Vonck stated that he would like to provide clarification, and that the definitions of the monuments are taken from existing ordinance 2020-154, which is being used as a basis and guidance for the proposal. Regarding the removal of the monuments, Mr. Vonck stated that City staff is following through on a request by City leadership, to take what is an entitlement action in order to give the City as many options as possible for future action. Mr. Vonck stated that ultimately it is City Council that has the authority to make such a decision, and the goal is to have clear approval to remove the monuments and accoutrements in the event that that is determined to be the desired action.

Mr. Vonck stated that, since this is a planning matter, it will require considerable civic engagement in order to arrive at a decision, which will take months if not years to happen.

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

Commissioner Wheeler asked if, in the event of a deferral, the Council could override CAR's decision. Ms. Jones stated that her understanding was that a deferral could not be overridden, but that it could be appealed, which could result in the Council making a decision.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he thought CAR needed to make a decision one way or the other, which Council could then override if they choose.

Commissioner Klaus stated that everyone is interested in Richmond's history and the pieces involved, and that he was not certain if the subset of members of the public were representative of the wider Church Hill neighborhood in their wish to keep the column in place.

Commissioner Klaus stated that to delay a decision on removal until a plan is agreed upon is problematic, as there has already been years of discussion about Confederate monuments, and that waiting for decision-making and funding for an alternate use of the existing monuments could take several additional years.

Commissioner Klaus stated that, as with Monument Avenue, he would like the City to retain the monument pieces in storage for some period of time, perhaps two years.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the gentlest means possible be used to remove the objects; the objects be removed in a single piece if possible, or be disassembled at the original joints;

all removed pieces be stored in a secure environment before final disposition; that the circular curbing be retained; and that the objects be retained for two year in a manner that they are available to the community for reuse.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that, even without the statue on top of it, the existing column of the Soldiers and Sailors monument is still identifiably a Lost Cause monument in that it is in the form of a victory column.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she was a member of the Mayor's monument commission, and that she was aware that discussion of these matters could go on and on.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she was receptive to concerns voiced about erasing history, and pointed out that this is the same comment made by members of the public who had not wanted the statues changed at all.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she believed the City could do better than retaining a victory column, and that removal of the monument will not mean giving up on the issues at hand as long as the public continues to call attention to them, and an effort is made to imaginatively reuse the space, which has now been without its statue for a year.

Commissioner Rodriguez expressed agreement that the pieces should be saved for possible reuse.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the roundabout would be retained. Commission Chair Johnson stated that this should be acceptable as a friendly amendment. Commissioner Klaus stated that streetscape and traffic calming measures are the purview of the Urban Design Committee, and members of the public concerned about those matters should attend the UDC meetings.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Danese , to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the gentlest means possible be used to remove the objects; the objects be removed in a single piece if possible, or be disassembled at the original joints; all removed pieces be stored in a secure environment before final disposition; that the circular curbing be retained; and that the objects be retained for two year in a manner that they are available to the community for reuse.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson , Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

8. [COA-091354-2021](#) Monument Avenue, various locations - Remove various monuments, pedestals, and a cannon.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Mr. Chris Frelke, Director of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Community

Facilities, stated that his department accepts the conditions suggested by Commission staff.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the retention of the roundabout curbing at the Stonewall monument would be considered. Mr. Frelke stated that he would defer that to the Department of Public Works, as this would be under their management once the base is removed.

Mr. M. S. Khara of DPW stated that DPW had found safety issues and a high incidence of crashes with the roundabouts at the Stonewall and A.P. Hill locations, and that for this reason it was determined that a change to a conventional intersection would be preferable.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he would think that adding a curb would actually slow traffic down.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Sarah Driggs introduced herself as co-author of a book on Monument Avenue, writer of the National Historic landmark nomination for the street, and a member of the Monument Avenue Commission. Ms. Driggs stated that she did not wish for the monuments to ever be reunited with their pedestals, but suggested that the pedestals be retained until a new plan is in place to reimagine Monument Avenue and the other confederate sites, as the pedestals could be useful and powerful for other statues, and the existing foundations could provide a cost savings.

Ms. Driggs stated that there would be immense symbolic power in reusing the confederate pedestals to support different personages or ideas; that getting rid of the pedestals would amount to concealing the history without addressing it; and that giving permission for the removal creates momentum which may be difficult to stop.

Ms. Driggs stated that City Council should be asked to do the hard work of discussing and planning how to undo the historic damage before permission is given to remove the pedestals.

Mr. Stewart Schwartz of the Partnership for Smarter Growth suggested that as much as possible of the roundabouts be retained and improved to function better as traffic calming elements, and that the Laburnum/Hermitage intersection be made into a true traffic circle. Mr. Schwartz suggested that the circle be retained at the Libby Hill Park location, and possibly some of the steps as an added disincentive to speeding.

Ms. Carrie Russell stated that she would be in favor of retaining the pedestal at Libby Hill as it is part of the visual landscape, that removal does not address underlying problems, and that there is no reason to rush the decision.

Ms. Catherine Driggs recounted the flooding in 1890 of the African Burial Ground, and the renaming in 1940 of the Stonewall Jackson Bridge. Ms. Catherine Driggs stated that the pedestals are reminders of white supremacy and as such should not be removed in an impulsive and hurried manner.

Mr. Robert Steele introduced himself as an architect and president of the board of trustees of the Branch Museum. Mr. Steele stated that he is part of the 70-person Reimagining Monument Avenue commission, which includes the VMFA and the Branch Museum and is committed to hearing all voices. Part of what has been heard is that this

is not a time to rush, and that though some people may believe the proposed removal would be a beautification, the other view is that it is imperative to do this properly and take time.

Mr. David Kreis of the Historic West Grace Street Association expressed support for removal as recommended by Commission staff, and for Commissioner Rodriguez' comments earlier in the meeting.

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

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the gentlest means possible be used to remove the objects; the objects be removed in a single piece if possible, or be disassembled at the original joints; all removed pieces be stored in a secure environment before final disposition; that if at all possible the circular curbing and roundabout be retained; and that the objects be retained for two year in a manner that they are available to the community for reuse.

Commissioners Rodriguez and Klaus suggested the amendment that the retention of objects be based on the timeframe of the VMFA-led Reimagining Monument Avenue commission.

Commission Chair Johnson suggested that the roundabout be retained. Commissioner Rodriguez suggested that this would be addressed by other City bodies in later decision-making stages.

Ms. Jones pointed out that the VMFA decision process will be a state process and that she was not certain if CAR could render a decision that depends on a State-level determination.

Mr. Mike Sawyer of DPW stated that the roundabout at Arthur Ashe Boulevard has had a very high number of crashes, including one pedestrian casualty, and this is the rationale for normalizing the intersection.

Mr. Vonck stated that as there is not a tangible aspect to a decision-making process, it would not be appropriate to insert it as a condition. Mr. Vonck stated that such a condition would in any case probably be beyond the scope of this body, but that if it is included it should entail a named timespan.

Commissioner Rodriguez suggested a 4-year timeframe.

Commissioner Danese stated that in his prior hometown, New Orleans, monuments were removed five years ago and the pedestals are still up as of this meeting, which is an excessively long time.

Commissioner Klaus clarified that the 4 years proposed would be the period of retention of the monuments in storage, and that the motion on the table would be for immediate removal of the pieces, followed by the period of storage.

Commissioner Klaus suggested that a 2-year limit would be better and also create a deadline for the Reimagining Monument Avenue commission to make a decision.

Commission Chair Johnson suggested that perhaps the curbing be retained as an

homage, but that he would not include that in the motion but just leave it as a suggestion.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the roundabout is a feature of Monument Avenue.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that Monument Avenue was partly built around monuments, but that the intersection of Monument Avenue and Arthur Ashe Boulevard was wedged in after the fact awkwardly, and that this probably explains the number of accidents. Commissioner Rodriguez suggested a fence or other item to encourage motorists to slow down.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the gentlest means possible be used to remove the objects; the objects be removed in a single piece if possible, or be disassembled at the original joints; all removed pieces be stored in a secure environment before final disposition; that if at all possible the circular curbing and roundabout be retained; and that the objects be retained for two year in a manner that they are available to the community for reuse.

The motion carried by the following vote:

9. [COA-091353-2021](#) Intersection of Hermitage Road and Laburnum Avenue - Remove a monument, pedestal, and remains.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Mr. Freilke stated that Parks and Rec are in agreement with staff recommendations, and stated that City staff have been working with descendants of A.P. Hill to arrive at a final resting place for remains.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Commissioner Pearson asked, as a point of clarification, that the current application does not pertain to the removal of remains. This was confirmed.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Sarah Driggs stated that the Commission seemed unconcerned with public opinions, and that she was in favor of removal as this monument is a grave marker in an unsuitable location, and is a danger to motorists as it reduces visibility and the City has been unable to install a workable traffic circle at that location.

Ms. Katherine Driggs stated that a reason to retain the monuments is the audience, and the African-American students of the school in front of the A.P. Hill monument do not need it as a reminder of everyday racism in their lives.

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

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

conditions are met: the gentlest means possible be used to remove the objects; the objects be removed in a single piece if possible, or be disassembled at the original joints; all removed pieces be stored in a secure environment before final disposition.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the gentlest means possible be used to remove the objects; the objects be removed in a single piece if possible, or be disassembled at the original joints; all removed pieces be stored in a secure environment before final disposition.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

11. [COA-091741-2021](#) 2516 E. Leigh Street - Construct nine, single-family, attached residences.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(5/25/2021\)](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report \(5/25/2021\)](#)

[Application & Plans](#)

[Staff Report \(6/22/2021\)](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Commissioner Rodriguez referred to a public comment letter about rezoning, and asked if the Commission needed to address this.

The applicant, Mr. Daniil Kleyman, stated that Sanborn maps indicate that prior to the school's erection in the 1920s there were 9 buildings on this property, so this project is in that sense a return to previous condition.

Mr. Kleyman stated that the existing use dates only from the 1980s, and the proposed usage would be a return to the usage during the era of historic usage for the region.

Mr. Kleyman stated that the applicants are working to develop outdoor access and usage solutions for tenants.

Mr. Kleyman stated that the vacant lot is private property, not a public park.

Mr. Kleyman stated that the existing house is sited right next to the alley and the suggestion to move it back. Mr. Kleyman asked about ways to screen the garage doors without making them inaccessible.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Alli Alligood stated that the full membership of ... had not had an opportunity to fully assess, having not realized the application was coming for review so soon, and requested a deferral to allow more time for consideration, feedback, and discussion with the applicant.

Mr. Havis Wright of 605 N. 25th St (double-check this) stated that he has concerns about the project and would like there to be a preservation of some sort of public green space made out of what remains of the school lot. Mr. Wright stated that residential uses in this area tend to be two-story, and that taller buildings in the area tend to be commercial and he'd like to see the proposed detached structures be more in line with established patterns.

Ms. Coqui Macdonald stated that she is concerned that this development will deprive the residents of the nearby 62-unit retirement home with green space, which will be deleterious to their health and emotional wellbeing.

The architect, Mr. Todd Dykshorn, stated that he has been working on the site plan for this project and the former Bowler School. Mr. Dykshorn stated that much of what is currently asphalt on the west side of the school will be freed up and will be usable for landscaping, and that there is also an unused section of land to the southwest. Mr. Dykshorn stated that the applicants have been discussing how to maintain and even improve the green space situation at this site.

Mr. Matt Jarreau stated that 618 N. 26th Street, the single-family home... that he likes the placement to make nice space between the dwellings placing the buildings far apart does more for the site and gives a better configuration of green space.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if public comment was the reason for staff's recommendation of deferral. Ms. Jones stated that the reason for deferral was that, though the applicants addressed many questions from previous review, she felt that they had not addressed the public space questions raised.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Danese, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to address Commission suggestions, including: reworking the location, form and massing of the proposed new construction at 618 N. 26th Street.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if there was a drawing that could clarify the planned arrangement of green space.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she appreciated the work that has gone into this project but that it still looks like a missing tooth in the neighborhood, which is something Commission tries to avoid.

Ms. Jones reviewed the site plan and floor plans for the project, including locations of private green spaces for each of the nine units.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that a source of frustration is that the community is accustomed to using a green space even though it was private property, but that the applicant had stated that there was an effort to provide more green space using the prior school grounds.

Commissioner Wheeler asked for clarification from the applicant regarding proposed green space. Mr. Kleyman stated that the Bowler School property is owned by someone else but that the applicants are working with this owner to devise usable outdoor space amenities. Mr. Kleyman stated that the Special Use Permit process will follow the CAR approval, and that some matters would have to wait for that to be addressed.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested that it might be worthwhile to defer, as it might be helpful to flesh out these details as well.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he would be okay with deferral as well, and that the green space allocation is still concerning. Commissioner Klaus stated that the space usage prior to the building of the school was less dense than what is proposed.

Mr. Kleyman stated that he did not see how green space on a property falls under the purview of the Commission of Architectural Review. Commission Chair Johnson pointed out that density is an issue. Commissioner Klaus pointed out a recent application for which a setback and a reduction in size of the building were required, so this sort of condition is not out of the ordinary for the Commission.

Mr. Kleyman asked for an acceptable solution.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the issue is the relation between the new massing and the old massing.

A motion was made by Commissioner Danese, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to address Commission suggestions, including: reworking the location, form and massing of the proposed new construction at 618 N. 26th Street.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 2 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

12. [COA-091347-2021](#) 4002 Hermitage Road - Replace slate roof with faux slate; and repair deteriorated architectural elements.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Mr. Dandridge.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there had been enforcement action associated with this application. Ms. Jones stated that there had been a stop-work order issued.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the applicant wished to comment on their application.

The applicant, Mr. Ken Aspinall stated that the applicants are in agreement with all staff recommendations except regarding the faux slate. Mr. Aspinall stated that he has seen the faux slate in use in the area, it is indistinguishable from genuine slate, and that materials availability, especially in the desired size, has been very challenging of late. Mr. Aspinall stated that the building was in disrepair and that the current owners have done extensive rehabilitation, and the goal is to restore it to its original condition. Mr. Aspinall stated that the roof has been built over several times in its history, and that a layer of cedar shake was found by the applicants.

Mr. Aspinall stated that the applicants had misunderstood permit requirements and have been working with the City to address that.

Commissioner Wheeler asked what percentage of the slate roof is damaged. Mr. Aspinall stated that it was 65-70%. Commission Chair Johnson asked if intact slate had been salvaged from the back. The applicant stated that there had not been any slate in the back, but metal and TPO, and that he was not sure about usability of the slate in the front.

Mr. Aspinall stated that it would probably be possible to reuse the slate on the other building on the property, the carriage house.

Commission Chair Johnson asked what material the applicants planned for the rear. Mr. Aspinall stated that it would be some combination of metal and/or TPO. Mr. Aspinall stated that it is only slate on the pitch of the roof.

Ms. Lisa Melara, another partner of K & L Sales, added on.

Mr. Aspinall stated that he would be glad to meet on site to better explain plans for the property.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if Commissioner Wheeler thought the slate on the roof was original. Commissioner Wheeler asked if there is cedar shake underneath.

Ms. Melara stated that the carriage house is largely visible from the street, and there is extensive slate on the roof but it is extensively damaged. Mr. Aspinall stated that the applicants had been able to salvage two pallets of slate.

Commission Chair Johnson and Commissioner Wheeler suggested scavenging slate from the carriage house to use for the main house.

Ms. Melara stated that the roof of the carriage house is twice the size of the front roof of the main house.

Ms. Jones stated that there appeared to be a lot more to the project than what was submitted, and suggested that the applicants meet with Commission staff to further explicate and discuss.

Commissioner Danese suggested an approval of some portions and deferral of others.

Ms. Jones suggested that most repairs could be approved by staff, and that the roof repairs be deferred until staff have a better sense of the roof conditions, materials, and visibility.

Mr. Aspinall stated that the applicants would be glad to meet with Mr. Dandridge.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commission Chair Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant meet staff at the site to determine the extent of the damage and the visibility of the main house roof and carriage house and formulate recommendations for repair and replacements to be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair. The remainder of the repair work will be administratively approved by staff.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commission Chair

Johnson, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant meet staff at the site to determine the extent of the damage and the visibility of the main house roof and carriage house and formulate recommendations for repair and replacements to be approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair. The remainder of the repair work will be administratively approved by staff.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Commissioner Andrew Moore

Excused -- 3 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner James W. Klaus

13. [COA-091337-2021](#) 724 N. 27th Street - Construct a rear, second-story addition.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Mr. Charlie Field, the applicant, introduced himself. He stated the rear, 1-story addition to the house is modern and on cinderblocks. He said they can't set the walls back without creating 8-inch holes. He said there is a cornice not extending past the edge of the roof, but in historic houses, the cornice usually does not extend past the edge of the roof, and with Italianate, it's usually only in the rear. Mr. Field said the project wouldn't take out any historic windows, but replacing plastic windows from a recent addition to make them symmetrical and make them match with the rest of the house.

Commission Chair Johnson requested clarification of Mr. Field's statement that the plans reviewed by the Commission do not reflect the actual plans. Mr. Field stated that the major difference is the roof on the plans CAR has extends over the porch, but they're actually proposing that the main roof stop at the edge of the building with a separate porch roof.

Ms. Jones asked if Mr. Field could email the updated plans on the day following the meeting. Mr. Field stated that he could.

Mr. Field stated that the main difference was that, following up on Commission feedback from previous review, they didn't have the smooth, vertical cladding trim separating on both sides to separate the addition from the house.

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

Commission Chair Johnson asked for clarification if applicant could not recess it because of the incorrect load on the perimeter wall. Commissioner Wheeler stated that this was part of the problem, and that the other issue is that drainage is required.

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

following conditions are met: the walls of the second story addition be inset by at least four inches in order to differentiate from the historic building and allow for flashing or coping; the roof cornice lines not extend past the walls of the historic building in order to maintain the overall form of the historic building; the roof specifications be submitted for administrative approval; the applicant lower the sills of the existing windows on the rear mass so that width and height remain unchanged; the railing be wood and utilize a Richmond Rail, or the pickets be placed on the interior of the rail for a more finished appearance, and the revised porch roof submitted to staff for administrative approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commission Chair Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the walls of the second story addition be inset by at least four inches in order to differentiate from the historic building and allow for flashing or coping; the roof cornice lines not extend past the walls of the historic building in order to maintain the overall form of the historic building; the roof specifications be submitted for administrative approval; the applicant lower the sills of the existing windows on the rear mass so that width and height remain unchanged; the railing be wood and utilize a Richmond Rail, or the pickets be placed on the interior of the rail for a more finished appearance, and the revised porch roof submitted to staff for administrative approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Commissioner Andrew Moore

Excused -- 3 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner James W. Klaus

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

14. [COA-091342-2021](#) 309 N. 28th Street - Construct a two-and-one-half story residence on a vacant lot.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Mr. Dandridge.

The applicant, Mr. Bill Laffoon, stated that the presentation seemed accurate and he saw no issue with accommodating staff concerns. Mr. Laffoon stated that the owner had a preference for masonry, brick, or stucco, and also would like to have a roof deck.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that the most important change seemed to be swapping the roof for a design more suited to the neighborhood. Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she liked the glass with the stucco but that it is currently overwhelmed by the third floor.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that this new construction is being done almost as a period piece with a more modern part on top of it. Commissioner Wheeler suggested to get more modern details with the cornice. Commissioner Wheeler suggested brick or possibly stucco for materials, and that the addition should probably have a shed roof as

suggested by staff and windows in the back. Commissioner Wheeler suggested taking the rail in back in a more modern direction, and that this advice could be applied in general.

Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler and stated that the 3rd story addition needs to relate better to the part below, and staff recommendations and Commissioner Wheeler's recommendations are good. He stated that they could make the porch more modern, and add more windows.

Commissioner Danese stated that there's a better way to marry the modern and traditional parts through materials and sloping, etc.

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-091345-2021](#) 2211 Jefferson Avenue - Construct a two-and-one-half story residence on a vacant lot.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant Joshua Bilder and architect Mr. Sebastian Quinn introduced themselves.

Mr. Bilder said in 2019, he proposed a different structure to the site. Mr. Bilder stated that the site is a gateway to the Church Hill neighborhood and that he wanted it to make a statement, and that he wished to retain as much as possible of the historic structure. Mr. Bilder stated that he did not think there was a single style on Jefferson Avenue but that it is something of a hodgepodge.

Mr. Quinn stated that he had been involved in several ecologically responsible infill projects and that the project is zoned with a zero lot line and that the applicants do not envision needing a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Quinn stated that the setbacks already are taking a significant fraction of the building space – the planned front setback is 7 feet, and also creating space between the historic property and the new townhouse, with the idea of being in line with the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the setbacks being recommended by staff were at upper levels of the buildings, not at ground level.

Mr. Quinn asked if the window alignment note by staff was a major concern. Ms. Jones stated that in conceptual review it is more of a note, but that window alignment might be a detail worth addressing.

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

Commissioner Danese stated that the upper floor setbacks were his biggest issue with the project, and that he was not sure of a solution.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he had a similar issue, and that it would be desirable to differentiate new construction from the historic on the 2nd and 3rd floors since all the other residential buildings nearby are 2 stories.

Commission Chair Johnson suggested that the light configuration be more similar to those of nearby buildings, such as 2 over 2.

Commissioner Wheeler asked for the zoning designation of the property. Mr. Rich Saunders of the Land Use office stated the zoning designation is UB-PE4 and does require commercial on the ground floor along the principal street frontage, and that one could argue that Jefferson Avenue is the main frontage for the building, so he believes a Special Use Permit might be required.

Mr. Quinn stated that zoning stated the Zoning Administrator could make a determination.

Mr. Saunders stated that it would be up to a Zoning administrator to determine this.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he appreciated the existing hyphen between the existing building and the planned one, but that a setback from the historic fabric is necessary, so that is an additional reason to set back from the commercial.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the proposed height is problematic, and that this is why the upper floor setback will be necessary, because most buildings in the area are 1 or 2 stories. Commissioner Wheeler stated that differentiating materials between old and new is good but that the setback will also be necessary.

Commissioner Rodriguez said she agreed with the setback issues, and suggested that the balcony have a railing.

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.

OTHER BUSINESS

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 PM.