

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
MINUTES
May 27, 2014**

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, May 27, 2014, at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Ms. Jennifer Wimmer, Chair
 Mr. Bryan Green, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Joshua Bilder
 Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Ms. Mary Harding Sadler
 Mr. Joseph Yates

Members absent: Mr. Sanford Bond

Staff Present: Ms. Catherine Easterling, CAR Secretary
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

Ms. Wimmer called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Resolution of Appreciation for Tyler Potterfield

The Commission briefly discussed the Resolution of Appreciation for Tyler Potterfield that Mr. Green drafted.

Ms. Easterling noted that she would send a copy of the resolution to Mr. Potterfield's wife.

Mr. Green read the Resolution of Appreciation into the record:

It is with a profound sense of loss that we, the members of the Commission of Architectural Review, mark the passing of T. Tyler Potterfield. The Commission honors his contributions to the preservation of the City's historic and natural resources and will mourn the loss of our colleague and friend for years to come.

From 1991 until his death on 25 April 2014 Tyler served as a planner for the City of Richmond, and with distinction as Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review and the Urban Design Committee. He managed the Section 106 review process for the City, inventoried and recorded the city's historic buildings and structures, served on the Vacant Building Review Team, and was an integral participant in developing the Citywide Master

Plan, Downtown Plans and, most recently, the Riverfront Plan. To record these accomplishments is to glance at the surface of Tyler's contributions to the City of Richmond. He enriched the lives of those around him in myriad ways.

*After his arrival in Richmond in 1991, Tyler became immersed in the history of our city's architecture and historic landscapes. His research placed special emphasis on African-American architects such as Charles T. Russell and John A. Lankford, the City of Richmond engineer Wilfred Emory Cutshaw, and the historic landscapes of iconic places such as Monroe Park and Capitol Square. Many insights were recorded in his 2009 book *Nonesuch Place: A History of the Richmond Landscape*. Tyler possessed an encyclopedic knowledge of Richmond's built landscape; a knowledge he freely shared with colleagues, commission members, interns, and young professionals. We have all benefitted from Tyler's deep understanding of the architecture of Richmond.*

Tyler, through his position as a planner, took a long view of the built landscape, and he found creative and innovative ways to preserve and enhance that landscape. His efforts to implement the Riverfront Plan were just beginning. Tyler's vision for transforming surviving pilings into a pedestrian and cycling bridge to connect the north and south banks of the James River was approved by the Planning Commission on 21 January 2014. We heartily endorse the Planning Commission's resolution to dedicate this new structure as the "T. Tyler Potterfield Memorial Bridge."

It difficult to encapsulate in relatively few words contributions as rich and varied as Tyler's gifts to his adopted city. His professional achievements, his conversations, discussions, tours and numerous personal interactions contribute immeasurably to an outstanding legacy. He was a colleague, friend, mentor, and public servant, and his influence will long be felt by those of us who were privileged to know him.

While we mourn his loss, we embrace his memory, and look to continue enhancing and preserving the City's resources in his honor.

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to approve the resolution in memory of Mr. Potterfield as drafted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates, and passed 7-0-0 (Mr. Hughes had not yet arrived).

Updates to the Design Guidelines

Ms. Wimmer thanked Mr. Green and Mr. Yates for working on drafting changes to the Standards for New Construction.

Mr. Green asked the Commission to look over the proposed changes and submit comments to Ms. Easterling via email.

Ms. Sadler noted that the Commission had previously discussed including

images illustrating successful infill projects.

Ms. Wimmer suggested that the Commission discuss updates to the *Guidelines* at the upcoming quarterly business meeting.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

Ms. Easterling noted that the Department of Planning and Development Review had transitioned away from using the City's FTP site for posting Commission applications and packets. She noted that they are now using Legistar, and asked members of the Commission to let her know if they have any difficulties with the new system of electronic packets.

Ms. Easterling reminded the Commission about the upcoming quarterly business meeting on July 8th. The Commission agreed to meet at 6:30 PM at Odell.

ENFORCEMENT

Ms. Easterling discussed several recent enforcement actions. She noted that staff had cited a property owner for replacing windows at a property in Shockoe Slip. She stated that the owner of that property had decided to appeal the Notice of Violation to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Ms. Easterling also noted that staff had cited several property owners in Church Hill for inappropriate alterations to a porch and changes to a previously unimproved parking lot.

Urban Design Committee Report

Mr. Green discussed recent reviews by the Urban Design Committee. He stated that the UDC had reviewed a final location, character, and extent review for the renovation of 1801 Commerce Road for the Department of Public Utilities. He noted that they also considered a final location, character, and extent review for renovations to the RMA Plaza at 2 S. 10th Street. Mr. Green stated that they also considered a final location, character, and extent review of the green alley connecting S and T Streets between 26th and 27th Streets. He stated that they reviewed a final location, character and extent review of improvements to Ancarrow's Landing, which includes remediation of contaminated soil and the addition of a new parking area and a restroom area.

Mr. Green also noted that the UDC considered anti-terrorist site improvements for the federal courthouse, and discussed ways to meet federal anti-terrorist requirements while maintaining a pleasant streetscape.

CONTINUATIONS AND DELETIONS

Ms. Wimmer stated that application # 3 for 22 S. Boulevard has been withdrawn by the applicant and that application #5 for 1006 N, 25th Street has also been withdrawn by the applicant.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Green made a motion to move item #10 for 604 W. 20th Street, item #7 for 2306 E. Grace Street, item #4 for 2213 W. Grace Street, and item #2 for 1812

Monument Avenue from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green, and passed 6-1-1 (Elmes opposed and Yates recusing himself).

Mr. Elmes inquired about the material for the handrail of 1812 Monument Avenue. Ms. Easterling confirmed that the proposed handrail would be painted PVC.

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to approve the consent agenda for the reasons cited in the staff report with the condition that the applicant for 1812 Monument Avenue must submit an elevation or a section drawing for the porch to Commission staff for final review and approval. Mr. Green seconded the motion, which passed 7-0-1 (Yates recused himself for Application No. 14-33).

Application No. 14-33 (J. & J. Yates)

1812 Monument Avenue

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-33 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Green seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-1.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to reconstruct a missing porch, and

 WHEREAS, the applicant must supply Commission staff with an elevation drawing or a section drawing of the front porch for final review and approval, and

 WHEREAS, the application is otherwise approved as submitted,

 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Green, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, and Wimmer

 Negative: None

 Abstain: Yates

Application No. 14-38 (J. & J. Wight)
2306 E. Grace Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-38 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Green seconded the motion, and it passed 7-0-1.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace brick steps,
and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes,
Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 14-32 (A. Van Ness 425 N. 26th Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to modify several window and door openings at the rear of a residence. She recommended that the applicant retain and repair one of the transom windows instead of replacing it, and recommended approval of the rest of the project as being in accordance with the Commission's design guidelines.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Jeremy Shank, a contractor with Paragon Construction, was present to answer questions.

Ms. Wimmer inquired if they planned on toothing in the bricks or doing a butt joint at the location where they are turning a door opening into a window opening. Mr. Shank stated that they planned to tooth in the bricks. Ms. Wimmer recommended that the applicant use either a butt joint or incorporate a slight recess in the brick in order to delineate the original door opening.

Mr. Shank confirmed that the door and transom windows would have simulated divided lights.

Mr. Elmes noted that it would be difficult to retain the original transoms while installing a new door system, since the transom was built as a part of the original door jamb.

There were no additional comments from the public.

Commission discussion began.

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to approve the application as submitted for the reasons stated in the staff report with the condition that the removed transom window must remain on site, and that the infilled portion of the historic door opening must utilize a butt joint or be slightly recessed from the plane of the brick wall. Mr. Elmes seconded the motion, which passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to modify window and door openings, and

WHEREAS, the removed transom window must remain on site, and

Application No. 14-37 (GTR Cedar LLC)
1903 E. Marshall Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a large multi-family dwelling in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District. Ms. Easterling discussed the Commission's previous reviews of the project, and noted that the Commission had issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for an earlier design of the building. She described the ways in which the current design differed from the previously-approved design. Ms. Easterling expressed concern with changes to the design of the building closest to the historic houses on Cedar Street. She also opposed changes to the base of the building that included the elimination of a number of pedestrian friendly elements. Ms. Easterling also noted that some of the changes to the balconies and building materials appeared to be inappropriate. She stated that she supports the elimination of the notched corners of the building, as this would make the structure more compatible with large-scale construction in the district.

Mr. Elmes discussed the Commission's previous reviews for the new members. He noted that the Commission had met at Jefferson Hill Park with residents to discuss the proposed development.

Ms. Sadler noted that it appeared that the windows for the project had been revised and now appear to have a more horizontal emphasis.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Fred Cox, the architect representing the owners, noted that he had sent Ms. Easterling an email enumerating how they intend to address the concerns raised in the staff report. Ms. Easterling confirmed that she had distributed this to the Commission. Mr. Cox stated that they are very receptive to any reasonable requests for revisions, and he noted that they agreed to make all of the changes suggested by staff. Mr. Cox discussed the four-over-four window configuration, and he confirmed that the balconies would be Juliet balconies.

Mr. Cox discussed the B-6 zoning of the project, and explained how the recessed area on the Cedar Street side of the development would work. He noted that the space behind the brick piers would likely be apartments. Mr. Cox confirmed that they had eliminated the trash enclosure on Cedar Street, and that all trash receptacles would be located along the alley. He noted that they could introduce more openings on the Marshall Street elevation, but would need to work to address privacy and safety concerns for the tenants. Mr. Cox also discussed his desire to change the cornice material to something more cost effective.

Mr. Cox stated that he would bring material samples to staff for review before any construction begins.

Mr. Elmes noted differences between the windows shown on the elevation drawings and the windows in the detail drawing. He stated that the windows appeared to be more squat, and recommended that the windows have a more

vertical orientation. He noted that the Commission could support aluminum-clad windows with simulated divided lights.

Ms. Sadler stated that she is still confused about what is behind the brick piers on the Cedar Street elevation. Mr. Cox stated that there would be a glass storefront.

Mr. Ben Cox stated that there are three apartment entries at that location due to the slope of the site. He confirmed for Ms. Easterling that the depth of the recess from the piers would be approximately four and a half feet.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he found a lack of a relationship between that podium base and the structural bays above. Mr. Cox stated that they would work to address this.

Ms. Wimmer discussed the need for additional openings along Marshall Street at the ground level.

Mr. Yates inquired about the change in distance between the new development and the historic buildings on Cedar Street. Mr. Cox indicated that the setback between the buildings had been reduced to eight feet.

Ms. Sadler commented that the previous submittal was more compatible with the adjacent historic buildings, and also recommended that the openings in the base align with openings on upper levels of the building.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the pedestrian scale is lacking.

Mr. Elmes agreed that the previously approved design was more compatible with the adjacent historic buildings. He inquired about the changes to the stair overrun tower and the rooftop railing.

Ms. Wimmer asked for additional information about lighting for the site.

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

Ms. Wimmer agreed with staff about eliminating the notches at the corners of the building. She noted that most of the Commission's questions and concerns centered around the openings in the plinth, the treatment of the roof, and the need for more vertically oriented windows.

Mr. Hendricks noted that the applicant should also address the pedestrian scale on Cedar Street, possibly with the introduction of a porch at the portion of the development closest to the adjacent historic buildings.

Mr. Yates indicated that the Commission's many questions and concerns needed to be addressed, and he suggested that the Commission defer the project. Mr. Cox stated that they would appreciate a conditional approval of the project.

Ms. Wimmer agreed that there are too many unknowns in the project to allow the Commission to vote on it today.

Ms. Easterling noted that staff allows greater flexibility with the submission deadline with projects that are deferred at a previous meeting.

Mr. Cox asked the Commission to develop a list of items that they should address before returning to the Commission.

Mr. Elmes commented that most of the Commission's concerns are similar to the ones listed in previous Commission discussions in 2012, including the need for more pedestrian-scale elements, changes to the windows, and the need for greater compatibility at the section of the building adjacent to the historic dwellings.

Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to defer the application while noting general support for the project, with the recommendation that the applicant resubmit a revised application with the following information: updated elevation drawings that should include revisions to the windows (with a greater emphasis on verticality), modifications to the base of the building to make it more pedestrian-oriented and to ensure ground-level openings relate to the openings in the upper stories, additional information about the screening of the rooftop mechanical units, final material selections (including lighting and railing), and a revised site plan that is more compatible with the front yard setback of adjacent historic properties

Ms. Sadler stated that she agreed with the staff recommendation to strengthen the corners of the building.

Mr. Yates seconded the motion, which passed 8-0-0.

Application No. 14-39 (M. P. H. LLC)
316 W. Leigh Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a rear addition at a property. Ms. Easterling noted that the rear addition would be located where there had previously been an enclosed porch on a concrete slab.

Mr. Yates inquired about the extent of the footprint of the addition. Ms. Easterling noted that the applicant would appreciate as much flexibility as possible concerning the depth of the addition.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Jeff Taylor with JL Taylor Construction was present to answer questions, He stated that there was a gaping hole in the structure so they took the non-historic enclosed space down for safety reasons. He commented that the main purpose of the project is to stabilize the building and get it into a position where a future owner can develop it. Mr. Taylor stated that they will leave the window and door openings in place on the side wall, but will cover them over.

Mr. Yates inquired if the door opening would be infilled with brick. Mr. Taylor stated that if the addition did not come out that far, they would need to close the opening. He stated that he could recess any brick infill at the opening.

Ms. Sadler inquired about the reconstruction of the rear brick wall. Mr. Taylor discussed the structural engineer's recommendation for the wall, and noted that the engineer had stated that two feet of the wall on either side could be saved in place. He stated that he would salvage and reuse as much of the original brick as possible on the outer portion of the wall.

Mr. Taylor confirmed for Ms. Wimmer that they would replicate all of the existing features, including the brick window arches and lintels.

Mr. Yates expressed concern about the brick being turned when it is replaced. Mr. Taylor stated that they would mark the brick as it came down.

Mr. Elmes suggested that they take the brick down by sections.

Ms. Sadler commented that the Commission's approval of this work does not equate to tax credit approval.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates introduced a motion to approve the application as outlined in the staff report the following conditions: the new addition must be recessed from the rear wall of the existing building at least four inches, the applicant should, if at all possible, adhere to the recommendation of the structural engineer and retain two feet on either side of the rear brick wall that is to be rebuilt, care should be taken to replicated the appearance of the original brick wall, a soft mortar with a high

level of lime should be used for the mortar joints, any original masonry openings to be infilled with brick should utilize a butt joint or brick recessed slightly from the original opening to maintain the dimensions of the original opening(s), and final color selections for the new addition must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff. Ms. Wimmer seconded the motion, which passed 7-0-1 (Green abstaining).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a new rear addition and rebuild a brick wall, and

WHEREAS, the new addition must be recessed from the rear wall of the existing building at least four inches, and

WHEREAS, the applicant should, if at all possible, adhere to the recommendation of the structural engineer and retain two feet on either side of the rear brick wall that is to be rebuilt, and

WHEREAS, care should be taken to replicated the appearance of the original brick wall, and

WHEREAS, a soft mortar with a high level of lime should be used for the mortar joints, and

WHEREAS, any original masonry openings to be in-filled with brick should utilize a butt joint or brick recessed slightly from the original openings to maintain the dimensions of the original openings, and

WHEREAS, final color selections for the new addition must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the application is otherwise approved as submitted,

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: Green

Application No. 14-40 (Michaux, LLC)
308 N. 21st Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for changes made to the previously-approved design of new residence located in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District. She noted that the applicant had come to the Commission for several reviews, and had been approved for all changes except the rear window openings and the cornice. She commented that the applicant would also like to revise the material for the front porch roof. Ms. Easterling noted that the cornice mock-up in place at the time of her site visit appeared to be appropriately scaled.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Mike Alexander and Mr. Dean McGee were present to answer questions.

Mr. Elmes commented that the triple window option at the rear of the building appears to be more compatible with the district. Mr. Alexander noted that, ideally, he would like to retain the existing windows. He distributed photographs of properties in the immediate area with similarly-styled windows.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the picture windows in Mr. Alexander's photographs are inappropriate replacement windows that are not original to those properties.

Mr. Green noted that those windows had been replaced prior to the designation of the district, and that the Commission would not have approved that work.

Mr. Alexander asked if the Commission could approve a different material other than metal for the front porch roof.

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

Ms. Wimmer agreed with Mr. Elmes that the triple window option had more of a vertical orientation, and is more appropriate.

Mr. Elmes stated that the Commission has approved the use of a modified porch roof material as an alternative to a metal roof. He stated that the applicant could use a TPO material turned over onto the gray side. Ms. Sadler commented that this would look like a typical hipped flat lock metal roof.

Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve the application as presented with the recommendation that the applicant utilize the three two-over-two window option with simulated divided lights, at the rear of the, and with the recommendation that Commission staff may review and approve substitute front porch roofing that is

comparable to a TPO roof flipped over to the gray side. Mr. Hughes seconded the motion, which passed 7-0-1 (Bilder abstaining).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to make changes to the design of a previously-approved new single-family dwelling, and

WHEREAS, the owner shall utilize the three-window option indicated in the application, and

WHEREAS, the Commission deferred review of changes to the materials for the front porch roof to staff for final approval, and noted that a TPO material flipped upside down to reveal the grey side underneath would be an appropriate change, and

WHEREAS, the application is otherwise approved as submitted, and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE:	Affirmative	Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates
	Negative:	None
	Abstain:	Bilder

Application No. 14-42 (A. & I. Cotterell)
2716 Monument Avenue

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to demolish a section of a rear brick wall and construct a new garage at the rear of a property in the Monument Avenue Old and Historic District. She noted that staff had initial concerns about the amount of wall being demolished, but the proposal to build the garage using brick salvaged from the walls and incorporate the cap detail into the design helps to mitigate those concerns. She recommended that the applicant specify for the Commission the style and materials for the windows on the side on the garage and return to staff with color selections and a brick sample for final approval. Ms. Easterling noted that the request for lattice on top of the brick wall appeared to exceed zoning requirements, and she recommended that the applicant consult with zoning staff before proceeding with the project.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Ms. Kristi Lane with Visible Proof, a representative of the owner, stated that it might be possible to build the garage without having to demolish portions of the wall to the degree indicated in the application.

Mr. Yates inquired about the brick intended for use at the garage above the existing wall. Ms. Lane stated that they would like to differentiate the brick in some way, though that could be through patterning and not brick color. Mr. Yates and Ms. Lane discussed the ways in which to differentiate the brick. Ms. Lane also noted that the proposed lattice would be lower than other wall heights in the immediate area.

Ms. Lane confirmed for Mr. Green that the brick of the rear wall did not match the brick used in the main house.

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

Mr. Yates commented that the garage would clearly appear to be new, but would be compatible with the house and the district.

Mr. Yates introduced a motion to approve the application in accordance with the staff report and with the condition that the brick used above the rear wall be differentiated in some way from the brick of the wall. Ms. Sadler seconded the motion.

Mr. Hendricks suggested that the differentiation could be done by recessing the brick slightly.

After further discussion the motion passed 8-0-0.

.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to modify a rear wall and construct a new garage, and

Application No. 14-43 (M. Blount)
6 North 1st Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to paint a mural on the side of a building where there is previously painted brick. He noted that because a parking lot is directly adjacent to the proposed mural location, any mural would appear very prominent and be highly visible along this block of N 1st Street. Mr. Palmquest noted the presence of a number of commercial buildings along this block. He stated that staff is not opposed to a mural at this location, but because of its prominent location, the color palette for the mural should be muted.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Shane Pomajambo of Art Whino was present to answer questions.

Mr. Green inquired if the applicant had obtained permission from the property owner for the use of this location. Mr. Pomajambo confirmed that the owner supports a project at this location, but would like final review of the artist selected for the site.

Ms. Wimmer asked Mr. Pomajambo to indicate the artist intended for this location.

Mr. Hughes inquired about painting murals onto historic buildings. Ms. Wimmer clarified that the Commission's mural guidelines allows them to consider murals on previously-painted secondary elevations of buildings on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Bilder expressed his concern over the content of the murals going up around the city. He stated that murals should complement the neighborhood. He stated that some of the murals look like artists on drugs had painted them.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the Commission does not regulate mural content.

Mr. Pomajambo noted that the artists painting the murals are not on drugs. He indicated that the mural project was a City-backed initiative that is encouraging murals for the Arts District.

Mr. Bilder asked the applicant why should they approve the mural. Ms. Wimmer stated that the applicant did not need to answer Mr. Bilder's questions, and that the Commission would review the mural applications based on the mural guidelines.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the color palette for the mural. Mr. Pomajambo confirmed that the artist would utilize a more muted palette at this location.

Ms. Easterling stated that the Commission imposed a similar condition on a previous applicant, and that they had used the muted palette required.

Ms. Carolyn Warner from the Historic Richmond Foundation requested that the Commission defer review of the mural applications to allow for additional dialog concerning the mural guidelines. Ms. Warner stated that this is not meant to impede on freedom of speech, but noted that it should be important that artists think critically about the significance and values of the buildings that they are painting. Ms. Warner suggested that muralists promote the history and character of the districts in their murals.

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

Ms. Sadler noted that the adopted text of the mural guidelines indicates that murals may be permitted for commercial buildings. Ms. Sadler stated that the mural is proposed for a residential building. She noted that this residential building is particularly rare in this part of the city, and so she opposes a mural at this location.

Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the mural's color palette is muted. Ms. Wimmer seconded the motion.

Mr. Hughes inquired about installing murals on commercial buildings versus multifamily buildings. Ms. Wimmer stated that this would be a good topic for the Commission's quarterly business meeting.

Mr. Elmes noted that he supports a mural at this location because of the presence of a number of commercial buildings in the area.

After further discussion the motion failed 3-5-0 (Bilder, Green, Hendricks, Sadler, and Yates opposed).

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to deny the application because it violates the mural guidelines which state that murals may be permitted on commercial buildings. She noted that the building in question is a residential building. Mr. Yates seconded the motion, which passed 5-3-0 (Elmes, Hughes, and Wimmer opposed).

Application No. 14-44 (E. Bucher)
404 N. Adams Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to paint a mural on the side of a previously-painted residential building located in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. Mr. Palmquist noted that the adopted mural guidelines state that murals may be permitted on commercial buildings, provided that certain guidelines are met. He noted that the proposal calls for a mural painted on a residential building, which goes against the adopted guidelines.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Pomajambo was present to answer questions.

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

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to deny the application as proposed for the reasons stated that in the staff report and because the adopted mural guidelines note that murals may be permitted on commercial buildings, and the proposed location is a residential building. Mr. Hendricks seconded the motion, which passed 7-0-1 (Yates abstaining).

Application No. 14-45 (C. Shell)
511 ½ N. Adams Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to paint a mural on the side of a previously-painted residential building located in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. He noted that the applicant proposes utilizing the entire southern façade for the mural, which faces a large parking lot that affords this façade a prominent view along the block. Mr. Palmquist stated that the adopted mural guidelines note that murals may be permitted on commercial buildings, provided that certain guidelines are met, and that this location is a residential building. Mr. Palmquist recommended denial of the project for this reason.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Pomajambo was present to answer questions.

Mr. Hughes asked Mr. Pomajambo why he proposed murals for so many residential buildings, in opposition to the guidelines. Mr. Pomajambo stated that he was unaware of the Commission's restriction of murals on residential buildings.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the guidelines indicate that the murals are more appropriate in commercial districts.

Mr. Green emphasized that the mural guidelines have nothing to do with the content of the murals.

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

Ms. Sadler introduced a motion to deny the application for the reasons cited in the staff report and for the reason that the building is a residential building and not a commercial building, which is in opposition to the mural guidelines. Mr. Green seconded the motion, which passed 8-0-0.

Application No. 14-46 (J. Pruett)
1013 West Franklin Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to paint a mural on the side of a previously-painted residential building located in the West Franklin Street Old and Historic District. Mr. Palmquist noted that the applicant proposes another residential building as the location for the mural, which goes against the mural guidelines that state that murals may be applied to commercial buildings. He also noted the residential character of the immediate area, and recommended denial of the application for those reasons.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. David Blarcum, a resident of 1015 W. Franklin Street, noted that most of the multifamily buildings in the area are also owner occupied. He noted that he owns several buildings in the area, and that he is mayor of West Avenue. Mr. Blarcum indicated that a number of his neighbors oppose a mural at this location.

Mr. Ken Roper stated that he lives on West Avenue noted that murals are very inconsistent with the residential character of the area. Mr. Roper stated that this area is already surrounded by VCU and new buildings. He expressed an interest in having the discussion about murals proposed by the staff of the Historic Richmond Foundation. Mr. Roper suggested that the Commission refine some of its mural guidelines.

Mr. Elmes noted that the Commission typically discusses updates to their guidelines at quarterly business meetings, which are open to the public.

Mr. William Thomas, a resident of 1015 W. Franklin Street, inquired if the owner of the building had given the applicant permission to paint on the building. Mr. Pomajambo stated that he has permission from all of the owners.

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

Mr. Yates that the location is not appropriate for a mural.

Mr. Yates introduced a motion to deny the application for the reasons noted in the staff report. Mr. Hendricks seconded the motion, which passed 8-0-0.

Application No. 14-47 (HRR)
307 N. 21st Street

Ms. Easterling presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to demolish and rebuild a single-family dwelling located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Ms. Easterling discussed the level of deterioration and the lack of historic integrity at the current building. She discussed the City's historic of property maintenance at the site, and noted that the Commissioner of Buildings had issued and then rescinded a notice of imminent danger for this building. Ms. Easterling noted that several Commission members had been able to access the interior of the building in order to assess its viability. She stated that the building has been severely compromised, and that the proposal to rebuild the structure is an appropriate means of mitigating the effect of the demolition. Ms. Easterling expressed concern over the elimination of the side porch in the design of the new building, and recommended that the applicant re-introduce the side porch or have an enclosed space that references the side porch.

Ms. Wimmer opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Peter Megyeri, the property owner, was present to answer questions.

Ms. Sadler inquired if the applicant had an opinion concerning staff's recommendation to reference the existing rear porch.

Mr. Megyeri distributed some revised renderings of the windows for the new house.

Ms. Easterling noted that she also recommends against a standing seam metal porch for the roof.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if the existing porch roof was curved or a straight line pitch Mr. Megyeri stated that it is hard to tell because the house is leaning so much.

Mr. Megyeri confirmed for Mr. Elmes that the windows will be wood and the front door will be three feet wide. He confirmed for Ms. Wimmer that the front door would be a single door.

Mr. Megyeri discussed the structural engineer's recommendation for the property, and noted that area contractor David Cooley stated that he would personally not attempt to straighten the existing house.

Mr. Megyeri stated that he would work with staff concerning final color selections for the building.

Mr. Megyeri confirmed for Mr. Hughes that he intends to salvage and reuse remaining cornice elements.

Mr. Bilder inquired if the house had once been attached on the right side. Mr. Megyeri stated that it had never been attached.

Mr. Megyeri noted that they would repair or rebuild the existing foundation on the same footprint as the existing building. He expressed an interest in parging the brick foundation. Mr. Megyeri and Mr. Elmes discussed the viability of repairing the foundation.

Mr. Elmes supported staff's suggestion to reference the existing side porch in the new design.

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

Ms. Sadler inquired if parging the brick foundation necessary, and Ms. Wimmer stated that if the brick was in bad condition, parging it would help. Mr. Elmes agreed that if the foundation is rebuilt, it may be so patched that parging would help its appearance.

Mr. Elmes acknowledged that the condition of the house warranted demolition. He noted his support for a three-foot front door with a transom window, as well as an open or enclosed porch on the side of the property.

Mr. Elmes introduced a motion to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report with the following conditions: the three-foot front door shall be a single door with a transom if at all possible, the windows shall be wood as indicated by the applicant, the porch roof may be membrane and not standing seam metal, final color selections must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, the building foundation may be rebuilt or parged, significant cornice details shall be salvaged and reused, and an open or enclosed side porch that shall reference the existing building's porch shall be incorporated into the design of the new structure, the design of which must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff. Ms. Sadler seconded the motion.

Mr. Hughes inquired about the reason for using one-over-one windows. Mr. Elmes noted that one-over-one windows are appropriate in instances when it is unclear as to the original configuration of the windows.

Ms. Wimmer suggested that the applicant salvage and reuse any decorative elements remaining on the building.

After further discussion the motion passed 8-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to demolish and rebuild a single-family dwelling, and

WHEREAS, the three-foot front door shall be a single door with a transom if at all possible, and

WHEREAS, the windows shall be wood as indicated by the applicant, and

WHEREAS, the porch roof may be membrane and not standing seam metal, and

WHEREAS, the final color selections must be reviewed and approved by Commission staff, and

WHEREAS, the building foundation may be rebuilt or parged, and

WHEREAS, the significant cornice details shall be salvaged and reused, and

WHEREAS, an open or enclosed porch that shall reference the existing building's porch shall be incorporated into the design of the new structure, and

WHEREAS, Commission staff must review and approve of the design of the porch or porch enclosure, and

WHEREAS, the application is otherwise approved as submitted,

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Green, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, Sadler, Wimmer, and Yates

Negative: None

Abstain: None

The meeting adjourned at 7:13 pm.

Catherine Easterling
Secretary to the Commission of Architectural