



Meeting Minutes
Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, April 27, 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, April 27, 2021 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES 2021.115](#) Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review

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

Call to Order

Commission Chair Neville Johnson called the April 27, 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.

Roll Call

Commissioner Bond entered the meeting late and voted on items on the Regular Agenda; however, the votes are not counted because his term with the Commission had actually ended before this meeting.

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

Approval of Minutes

February 23, 2021

Secretary's Report

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

Ms. Jones announced that she had just resigned from her position with the City of Richmond, and her last day would be May 28, 2021 – thus, she would be working with the Commission of Architectural Review through the May meeting. Staff were working internally to identify existing staff who can take over some of the responsibilities of the position.

Monument Removal

Ms. Jones had emailed information to Commission members about new guidance from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for the removal of monuments, as this topic is likely to be revisited soon. Acting Director Kevin Vonck would hopefully be providing additional information on this subject.

During the previous CAR discussion about monuments, concerns had been voiced about guidance from DHR, and about whether CAR has purview over removal of the City's monuments, since they are in the public right of way. The City Attorney's office has since provided to Ms. Jones the direction that the Commission will be required to review the applications for removal.

Ms. Morgan stated that she believed the DHR guidance about monuments to be somewhat cost-prohibitive in most cases, calling as it does for intensive re-creation of the monuments, most of which are already down. Ms. Morgan stated that 3-D scanning of the monuments as called for by DHR seems unnecessary, as the monuments do still exist.

Commission Chair Johnson asked Ms. Jones for confirmation that most of the monument-related items CAR would be reviewing would be the pedestals. Ms. Jones stated that she believed that would be the primary focus of the applications. Ms. Jones stated that monument reviews will be of relocation as such, not of the eventual locations of the monuments, since those are as yet unknown.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the monument review items would go before someone else for review before CAR, for example the Urban Design Committee. Ms. Jones stated that the applications would also be reviewed by UDC and the City Planning Commission; and that she did not yet know the sequence of these reviews.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked Ms. Jones for a description of the review path for monument applications. Ms. Jones stated that CAR would only be reviewing the relocation, and not dealing with the subsequent use of the existing monument sites, nor with the ultimate location of the monuments except in cases where the planned relocation was to a City Old and Historic District, in which case CAR would review that aspect at that time.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked who initiates the application, and whether the City will do this. Ms. Jones stated that another City agency will submit the applications to CAR, and that she had been working with other City agencies to develop the application requirements.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that it was unknown which monuments would be dealt with, and some have attendant issues which will have to be dealt with before any CAR review.

Ms. Jones stated that CAR will not be dealing with the ultimate location of monuments unless they end up being re-sited within a City Old and Historic District.

Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones stated that no major projects had been reviewed for administrative approval during the past month.

Enforcement Report

The Virginia Union University enforcement issue regarding signage will be reviewed by the Planning Commission at their next meeting, though to Ms. Jones' knowledge staff is recommending against approval of the sign.

The RVA 311 online system continues to be used for reporting violations and working with colleagues in Code Enforcement and Property Maintenance, and seems to be working well so far.

Green Roof Administrative Approval Guidelines

Due to more preparation being needed, Ms. Jones suggested that the Green Roof discussion be tabled until the next meeting, or possibly be dealt with at an interim meeting.

Other Committee Reports

Ms. Jones stated that staff would be meeting later in the week with owners of 3101-3105 East Marshall regarding outstanding items requiring review, discussion, and approval from when Permits staff reviewed the project, and in light of the Special Use Permit applied for. This is a follow-up to the approval-with-conditions for this project which was granted by CAR after reviewing the project in 2020, and staff are hopeful that outstanding items can be administratively approved in light of the conditions of the Commission approval.

Commission Chair Johnson adjourned the business portion of the meeting at 3:47 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.

Commission Chair Johnson explained that there is an order to the meeting, starting with the Consent Agenda, followed by the Regular Agenda, and concluding with the Conceptual Review. At appropriate times, applicants will have an opportunity to speak in regard to their applications.

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 Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to move the 2nd item, 3014 East Broad Street, to the Consent Agenda to be approved as submitted.

Commissioner Klaus stated that this project had been approved some years previous with the condition that the color of the roof needed to be reviewed and approved and needed to be darker. Commissioner Klaus suggested that, since the Commission is making an exception by allowing the proposed shingle roof material, a condition be added that the color be administratively reviewed and approved by staff.

Mr. Dan Montgomery stated that the roof had already been replaced and is a dark gray, only slightly darker than the previous roof color.

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

Commissioner Morgan stated that in the few photos provided the roof does appear to be darker.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 5 - Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Coleen Butler Rodriguez, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan,
No – 3 - Commission Chair Johnson, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Sean Wheeler

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to move the 6th item, 1635 Monument Avenue, to the Consent Agenda.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that this application had been deferred to allow the applicant more discussion with neighbors, and that this discussion would seem to have occurred in the interim.

The applicant Mike Hogan stated that conversations with neighbors had occurred since the previous Commission review, and revisions were made in response to their concerns about height, as well as modification of the planned mud room to make it an interior space and not an exterior addition. Mr. Hogan stated that he believed the neighbors were satisfied with these changes.

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 8 - Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Coleen Butler Rodriguez, Commissioner Kathleen

Morgan, Commission Chair Johnson, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Sean Wheeler

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commission Chair Johnson, to move the 4th item, 1518 West Main Street, to the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Morgan stated that most of the issues expressed via public comment pertained to Zoning and parking details which do not fall under the purview of CAR, and also that the project has undergone conceptual review several times.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the applicant had any objection to the item being moved to the Consent Agenda. The applicant, Mr. John Conrad, stated that he did not.

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 8 - Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Coleen Butler Rodriguez, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commission Chair Johnson, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Sean Wheeler

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to approve the Consent Agenda with staff conditions with the exception of item #2, 3014 E. Broad Street, which would be approved as submitted.

Commissioner Wheeler asked for clarification regarding whether the applicant for item #4, 1518 W. Main Street, had applied for rehabilitation tax credits with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. Mr. Conrad stated that the applicants had applied for tax credits and had met with both Ms. Jones and with a representative from DHR.

Ms. Jones stated that the representative from DHR had appeared to be in agreement with the revisions made to this project based on the last Commission meeting.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that his only concern with this project was that the Commission's decision was consistent with its decision on another property down the street, at 3001.

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.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there were any further comment or questions regarding the Consent Agenda. There were none.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to approve the Consent Agenda with staff conditions with the exception of item #2, 3014 E. Broad Street, which would be approved as submitted.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

1. [COA-090077-2021](#) 2320 E. Marshall Street Rear - Revise previously approved plans for a rear building.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Maps](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: final material, color, window, and door specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; additional information about the proposed upgrades, including the fence and lighting, be submitted for staff review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

2. [COA-090103-2021](#) 3014 E. Broad Street - Replace a three-tab shingle roof with architectural shingles and install an awning over a rear door.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, 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 Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

4. [COA-089993-2021](#) 1518 W. Main Street - Construct a new three- and four-story mixed-use building.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner, seconded by Commissioner, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the final material specifications be submitted with the permit applications; the applicant work with staff regarding the location and possible screening of the HVAC units during the review of the special use permit; any changes or additional conditions imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources be submitted to staff for review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

6. [COA-087763-2021](#) 1635 Monument Avenue - Construct a rear and a side addition and a roof over an existing deck.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(3/23/2021\)](#)[Staff Report \(3/23/2021\)](#)[Application and Plans](#)[Base Map](#)[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner, seconded by Commissioner, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the rooftop addition be a light color; specifications for all proposed materials including windows and doors be submitted for administrative approval; the new windows on the rear addition fit within the existing jambs and not increase the width of the window openings, and be a contemporary design; the brick for the addition be differentiated in tone and color to distinguish the historic building and the new construction; all chimneys be retained, and the plans updated to reflect this prior to submitting for building permits.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

REGULAR AGENDA

3. [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](#)

The application was presented by Mr. Alex Dandridge.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if the age of the windows in the addition was known. Mr. Dandridge stated that he had not been able to ascertain when those windows had been installed; however, they do match the other windows of the residence as well as many other windows in the surrounding area.

The applicant Maria Tedesco introduced herself and stated that when she purchased the house two and a half years ago there were no storm windows installed, and also that she does not like storm windows, that they detract from the appearance of a house, and that they will not solve the problems she is attempting to solve by replacing the windows. Ms. Tedesco stated that she believed that the windows she has proposed would maintain the look and feel of the house.

Commissioner Klaus asked how it was ascertained that the existing windows are not original to the house. Ms. Tedesco stated that she had had vendors and other people visit her house and inform her that the windows are not original. Ms. Tedesco stated that her understanding was that the storm windows had not been effective at insulating, and this is why they were removed.

Stephen Young of Renewal by Anderson / Richmond Window Corporation stated that the windows are a composite material, Fibrex, which is in use throughout Monument Avenue.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the windows are deteriorated to the point where they require replacement. Mr. Young stated that the issue not so much the repair of the windows but their fitment and also their capacity to insulate, not only in terms of temperature but also in terms of noise. Ms. Tedesco stated that the traffic noise on Monument prevents her from sleeping.

Mr. Danese asked if the applicant knew what kind of insulation had been used on the walls and ceilings. Ms. Tedesco stated that the sound is distinctly coming through at the windows. Ms. Tedesco stated that she has used foam soundproofing on the interior, which is effective, but it is unattractive.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he had sympathy for the applicant's situation, but that the Commission has never allowed replacement of windows which are intact and not in disrepair, and he would be reluctant to open up that option, especially in such a historic area as Monument Avenue.

Commissioner Klaus suggested that interior double-paned storm windows might be a good solution, one that he has used himself, and also that a window salesperson might not be the most reliable authority on the repair or usability of the existing windows.

Ms. Tedesco stated that 8 of the windows are not original to the house. Commissioner Klaus stated that Ms. Tedesco had not substantially proved this, based on secondhand witness reports without photo verification, and that when he visited the house he could not

visually tell the difference between those 8 windows and the other windows on the residence.

Commissioner Wheeler agreed that interior storm windows are a good solution, stating that he also used them on his own home.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she understood about both noise and temperature insulation, and suggested that in addition to interior storm windows consideration be given to additional wall insulation products. Commissioner Rodriguez stated that it would be helpful to determine more conclusively whether or not the windows are historic.

Ms. Jones stated that, if the application is deferred, she could do a site visit and historic research about the windows.

Mr. Young stated that the room where the windows in question are located is constructed differently from others in the house, and that this is part of the reason those windows were assumed to be non-historic.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Danese, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to provide information about which windows are original, to consider interior storm windows and additional insulation.

Commissioner Danese suggested that, since the room where the 8 windows are located is an old sleeping porch, he suspects none of the windows in it are original, and that he would be happy to visit and inspect the room to determine if the windows are original or not.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the Valentine is a great resource for researching questions such as this, and that if the applicant could find photo evidence that the anomalous room had once been a porch and not an addition, this would go to support her contention that those windows are not original.

A motion was made by Commissioner Danese, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to provide information about which windows are original, to consider interior storm windows and additional insulation.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

5. [COA-090038-2021](#) 908 N. 24th Street - Construct a new two-story, single-family, detached residence.

Attachments: [Application and Plans \(4/27/2021\)](#)[Base Map](#)[Staff Report \(4/27/2021\)](#)[Application & Plans](#)[Staff Report \(6/22/2021\)](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Commissioner Bond joined the meeting during the presentation and discussion of this proposal.

The applicant architect, Mr. Mark Baker, stated that the applicants had met with staff following the conceptual review and had attempted to address the issues raised at the conceptual review.

Mr. Baker suggested that the reasons provided by staff for the recommended deferral be converted to conditions of approval. Mr. Baker stated that a number of items brought up by Ms. Jones were changes that the owner would be willing to make.

Mr. Baker stated that the biggest issue pertained to what staff had commented regarding the front porch. Mr. Baker stated that, time allowing, he would be happy to list the recommended changes which the applicants would be amenable to making.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the biggest issue seemed to be the front porch ingress/egress.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the porch egress proposed was in response to a Zoning requirement. Mr. Baker stated that the proposed ingress/egress design was not driven by Zoning.

Mr. Baker stated that where Zoning is concerned it is often a matter of a minimum setback, but that in the case of an R-62 zone it is a matter of a maximum setback – the Zoning requirements call for buildings to be brought closer to the street rather than set back further.

Mr. Baker stated that Zoning staff had considered an earlier iteration of the porch design, but that they liked the smaller porch proposed.

Mr. Baker stated that on the subject block there are a number of buildings with minimum setbacks, but the fronts of all of those dwellings are parallel to the street line. At the subject property, the street line abruptly cuts back against the front of the proposed dwelling. Mr. Baker stated that the smaller porch proposed gives some relief but allows the building to still be moved forward so as to respect the neighboring properties and their smaller setbacks.

Mr. Baker stated that the subject residence is 50 feet deep, whereas the adjacent house at 906 N. 24th Street has a depth of 58 feet. Mr. Baker stated that the lots on the street taper in size as one moves east, reducing feasible house size, and adding a porch compresses the size further.

Mr. Baker stated that the proposed house is modestly sized at about 1800 square feet based on exterior dimensions, and that leaving the house in its current proposed location leaves some space in the back of the property allows for service functions, as well as

leaving some usable side yard open space.

Mr. Baker stated that the previously existing house at the site would have taken up almost all the available space on the lot, which the applicants wish to avoid.

Mr. Baker stated that the applicants had been interested in enhancing the feature on the side, putting a foundation under it, bumping it out and adding windows on the side. Mr. Baker stated that the applicants would also like to put 3 windows on that bay in order to address staff comments about needing more windows, less hard surface area, and a more consistent window pattern; the 3 windows would be balanced with a larger window above.

Mr. Baker stated that all of the conditions mentioned by staff were items that the applicants could address and work out with staff.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the change in the design of the bay described by Mr. Baker sounded fairly major, and that the Commission always wants to avoid putting too much of a burden on staff, having them make decisions about project changes which they may or may not be comfortable with.

Commission Chair Johnson asked for any Commission questions for the applicant. Mr. Baker stated that the applicants are not as far from having an approval-ready application as might seem.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the project issues yet to be resolved fall just beyond what staff could be expected comfortably to approve on their own. Commissioner Klaus stated that important items needing revision and further review is the enlargement of the bump-out on the side, which needs to better address the footprint of the previously existing structure on site; and the fenestration on the side.

Commissioner Klaus stated that another issue appeared to be a nod to modernity but a somewhat undeveloped one, and about the colors of which Commissioner Klaus also had questions.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he would prefer the house to have a full-size porch, but that he understood the applicant's rationale for pulling back the house and having a smaller porch.

Commission Chair Johnson suggested that the porch design be a bit more of an homage to the original porch, especially given the visibility of this feature.

Mr. Baker asked if in the Commission's experience there had been a precedent for an in-between-sized porch, perhaps of a two-bay design, something between the full-width type and the small one currently proposed.

Ms. Jones stated that she could provide an example of a recently-approved porch that would be helpful.

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

Commission Chair Johnson opened the floor for a motion and commission discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to defer the application for the reasons cited in the staff report and recommend the applicant meet with staff to discuss incorporating the Commission feedback and guidelines and to review the application requirements; the applicant consider a fenestration pattern in

keeping with the surrounding area, including larger windows on the first floor, and submit a window schedule in a subsequent application; the applicant reconsider the right side elevation to create a more balanced window alignment and consider another first-story window to balance the fenestration pattern on the rear; and the applicant consider screening the HVAC unit and the screening be submitted to staff for review and approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to defer the application for the reasons cited in the staff report and recommend the applicant meet with staff to discuss incorporating the Commission feedback and guidelines and to review the application requirements; the applicant consider a fenestration pattern in keeping with the surrounding area, including larger windows on the first floor, and submit a window schedule in a subsequent application; the applicant reconsider the right side elevation to create a more balanced window alignment and consider another first-story window to balance the fenestration pattern on the rear; and the applicant consider screening the HVAC unit and the screening be submitted to staff for review and approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

7. [COA-090039-2021](#) 515-517 N. 28th Street - Construct two, two-story detached garages at the rear of each property.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Commissioner Wheeler asked the height measurement of the existing structure.

Ms. Jones stated that she believed the house height was about 24 feet and the height of the addition at the rear about 22 feet. Ms. Jones stated that the height at the peak appears to be about the same height as the approved addition.

Mr. Matt Jarreau introduced himself as representative of the property owner.

Mr. Jarreau stated that the height of the main house is 26 or 27 feet tall at the roof peak, and that the addition is 21 feet tall but with a roof that slopes up toward the existing structure.

Mr. Jarreau stated that the applicants are dealing with head height in the proposed building, and the struggle to arrive at a usable building. Mr. Jarreau stated that the applicants have tried to be as respectful as possible to Commission wishes and reduce the size, but still have a functional building.

Mr. Jarreau asked, regarding the suggestion that the new building have a shed roof, whether this entailed eliminating the standing seam metal roof altogether and just having gently sloped siding from inside the lot to the alley, or if the standing seam roof should be retained on the alley side and have a gentle slope from the top of the A frame back to the

rear porches.

Ms. Jones stated that in the past, shed roofs had been used on outbuildings, including one and a half story buildings, to minimize the overall look and appearance – the shed being a gentle slope as opposed to a peaked gable with dormers.

Mr. Jarreau stated that he believed a shed roof, with the siding continuing further up the new building, would actually make it appear larger than what has been proposed.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission motion and discussion.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant work with staff to design a more compatible roof form and to lower the height of the proposed buildings so they are subordinate to the historic house and approved additions and the final plans submitted to the Chair and Vice-Chair for approval.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he believed staff suggestions were going in the right direction, and that the very steeply pitched roof is incongruous and problematic and makes the outbuilding look like a little house.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the Commission seems to be amenable to an outbuilding living space, but the building needs to look more like a garage to suit Church Hill, with an appropriate roof form, and not like a little house.

Commissioner Danese stated that the size of the project footprint is too large and not subordinate enough.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the project had gotten off track between reviews, and that a shed-like design would help alleviate some of the busy-ness of the design, and also better address the rear portion of the existing structure, which has a lower addition portion to the rear. Commission Chair Johnson stated that he did not know if this would be accomplished with low sloping roofs on the front with a deeper slope toward the interior of the yard, but that he would be comfortable with something like that.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he was concerned that a shed roof would make the building appear taller, even though it is not, because the roof line would be raised up.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the project is akin to other one and a half story buildings that CAR has approved in the past, but that it does not quite fit with the neighborhood.

Commission Chair Johnson asked Ms. Jones if the motion would put too much pressure on staff to arrive at a solution with the applicant. Ms. Jones stated that staff is open to suggestions of other roof forms, that might achieve the desired height but reduce the bulk of the design with the gable and shed dormers.

Commissioner Danese stated that the size is still an obstacle, and suggested that the Commission could potentially vote to defer, to allow the Commission an opportunity to think of potential solutions to provide to Ms. Jones, from which she could choose.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the height of the primary roof is an issue, and that lowering the top pitch and raising slightly the lower pitch might be an effective solution,

and would make the outbuilding less resemble the main house.

Mr. Jarreau stated that there was a garage approved on the 400 block of Chimborazo with a shed roof, angled very low, and it was a simple two-story frame structure. Mr. Jarreau suggested that maybe something like that would be deemed more appropriate.

Commission Chair Johnson asked Ms. Jones if this kind of thing was what staff had in mind.

Ms. Jones stated that she believed there might have been a different context for the outbuilding on Chimborazo, though she would have to check to be sure.

Commissioner Klaus stated that there would be no functional difference between the approval moved for and a deferral, and that staff seemed to be comfortable working with the applicant to sort out the details of the approval.

Ms. Jones suggested that there could be a friendly amendment that the adjustments to the proposal be approved by Chair and Vice-Chair. Commissioner Danese agreed to this.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant work with staff to design a more compatible roof form and to lower the height of the proposed buildings so they are subordinate to the historic house and approved additions and the final plans submitted to the Chair and Vice-Chair for approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson, Commissioner Mitch Danese and Commissioner James W. Klaus

Excused -- 2 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

8. [COA-089504-2021](#) 2516 E. Leigh Street - Construct nine single-family, three-story, attached residences.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Commissioner Danese asked if the brick color was appropriate or if it was something the applicant could work on modifying with the staff.

Mr. Todd Dykshorn identified himself as one of the architects working with the owners on the project.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the submitted renderings show darker colors than would be accurate, although he conceded that the brick color is not quite right.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the applicants had no objection to most of the staff

suggestions, including omitting the proposed latticework screening for the porch.

Mr. Dykshorn asked for further detail on what sort of device or element could be used for screening the garage doors, while maintaining access to them. Mr. Dykshorn stated that the applicants were attempting to align the garage doors in such a way that they do not impinge on the alley.

Ms. Jones stated that staff had an example of some screening that was approved for interior garages, which they could share with the applicants.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that all of the properties have a courtyard, and the current plan was to have the HVAC equipment in those courtyards, shielded from public view by walls and gates.

Regarding the horizontal element, Mr. Dykshorn stated that the applicants had been trying to not align very much with the neighboring school, as that is a much more formal type of structure in terms of material and proportions, but that he thought that it might be nice to have some subtle tie-ins to the school.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the Sanborn map shows that there were seven houses on the easternmost portion of the lot, probably at the same location as 3 or 4 of the proposed 9 structures, and that the rest of the lot seems to have historically been open space next to the school – open space which is currently used as a park by the neighborhood. Commissioner Klaus asked if this open space had not been historically attached to the school, and whether the subject lot had been bought from the owners of the school building.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the Commission had just taken great pains in a similar situation, with a development on West Main Street, to make sure that sufficient space was left between it and the adjacent historic Jackson School.

Commissioner Klaus expressed concern that the lot proposed for this development belongs to the historic school adjacent, and asked how it was that the area proposed for development was to be broken off from the school property, and whether the Commission could say that they do not approve of buildings going into a space that has always been empty.

Commissioner Klaus expressed confusion as to how the current subject lot came to be.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the corner property is currently school property, and the proposed development is to break these properties off of that property and reconfigure the access and alleys to it. Mr. Dykshorn stated that other situations in Church Hill have been encountered in which there were houses previously on sites where schools were built. Mr. Dykshorn stated that, to properly answer Commissioner Klaus' question he would have to research further, which he has not done at this point. Mr. Dykshorn stated that he did not believe the school was the first building on its site, despite being 100 years old.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that he did not know whether the public used the now vacant area as a park, and stated that he believed it was intended for use by residents of the school project.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the school property spans the whole block, and the proposed townhouses would be taking property from it.

Commissioner Klaus stated that based on public comment there is a lot of use of the area as a park by the neighborhood, whether or not it is officially so designated.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the area in question is not a designated park, and that he did not believe it was fair to assess the project on those grounds, since it is not a public park.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that one of the concerns about the project was whether land is being taken from a historic building in order to make the project work, and asked Ms. Jones to bring up the fire insurance map to potentially clarify the division of the parcels in question.

Ms. Jones stated that according to the National Register nomination for this property, the existing school was the second school built on the site; the nomination did not mention the historic parcel boundaries. Commission Chair Johnson stated that this would seem to indicate it was just one big parcel, with the one building on it.

Commissioner Wheeler asked what special circumstances were involved in the Special Use Permit being applied for. Mr. Dykshorn stated that there were two special circumstances. Mr. Dykshorn stated that he believed 60 units had been developed within the school, about 20 years ago; reduction of the site will shrink the site to lower than the 60,000-square feet required for by-right use of those units. This circumstance was the first reason for the Special Use Permit.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the townhouse sites had initially been laid out to be zoned R-63 by-right, and there were 8 units; this was then revised with the idea of offering 9 smaller units for lower-income housing by building the two smaller buildings on the corner, instead of the one larger building initially envisioned. The area for the 9 units was then just under what was required by the Zoning designation for a single-family parcel in R-63. This circumstance was the second reason for seeking a Special Use Permit.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Havis Wright, resident of 605 N 25th Street, stated that the scale of the building proposed seems more akin to commercial edifices, funeral homes, or school buildings than to residential buildings in the area, and the design, lacking porches and having off-street parking, does not offer opportunities for tenants to interact with neighbors. Mr. Wright stated that, due to the older demography of the Bacon-Bowler development, there is significant ambulance traffic through the area. Mr. Wright expressed concern that the new building's design plan, involving revision of the alley, would tend to impede this traffic flow. Mr. Wright stated that traffic is already challenging and prone to blocking residents in, and putting all of Bacon-Bowler's traffic directly behind that building would potential trap residents who live along the northern part of the alley.

Mr. Wright stated that he would like to hear some ideas about ingress and egress for residents of the new buildings as well as the extant portion of the parcel.

Ms. Nancy Lampert stated that this is one of the RRHA's senior living areas, and that many of the residents have their own vehicles. Ms. Lampert stated that many of these parking spaces will be eliminated, which is problematic as many of these tenants have mobility issues. Ms. Lampert echoed Mr. Wright's concerns regarding emergency personnel and their ability to maneuver.

Ms. Gabrielle Clapman of 518 N. 26th Street stated that the look of the proposed building is incongruous with Church Hill and also unwelcoming, as it has a lot of walls facing out and a lack of greenery. Ms. Clapman stated that she hoped more thought would be given to the size, and to porches.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that at this juncture the Commissioners would weigh in with their feedback.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the separation from the school, as mentioned by Commissioner Klaus, is a primary concern that warrants further investigation.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he was uncertain about the windows having some with shutters and some without, and stated that in general he does not favor shutters. Commissioner Wheeler recommended joining the two dormers, and having more separation between the project buildings, in terms of space and also materials. Commissioner Wheeler stated that it appears that there is an English basement design, which would require the additional feature of a guardrail. Commissioner Wheeler stated that front porches should be considered, though this might mean losing the English basement access, and iterated that an English basement might not be the best option.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that some design element to turn the corner is good, but perhaps a brick course or other device rather than shutters. Commissioner Wheeler stated that asphalt shingles are not allowed, so that roof material at the corner would have to be changed.

Commissioner Wheeler stated although the rear elevation would mostly be blocked by the garages, it would be helpful to have the elevation between the garages and the structure. He stated that the windows on the lower level should be taller than the ones on the upper level, and that in general the proportions should be addressed for consistency. Commissioner Wheeler stated that he would be fine with the privacy screen if the porch were larger.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the open space adjacent to the school is a concern and that it appears to have been there for about 100 years, possibly used as a playground, and if that is the case then it would be the remit of the Commission to preserve that. Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement with many other items raised, including scale, incongruity, and opposition to the shutters, but stated that the issue of the open space is paramount.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he echoed the concerns voiced, and that he would be particularly concerned about the structures on the corner on 26th Street because they're on a prominent corner and that any kind of setback to pull the buildings away from the school and give some depth to the corner would be positive. Commission Chair Johnson stated that he is concerned about the coloration. He stated that resolving some of these questions would help assuage the concerns of the neighbors. Commission Chair Johnson stated that the buildings are large, and how to moderate the impact of this is the challenge.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she would like to address the question of the green space and whether it would fall under the Commission's remit to preserve it. Commissioner Rodriguez stated that the size and aesthetic of the building seemed very out of place with the area.

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.

9. [COA-090098-2021](#) 128 W. Clay Street - Add a rooftop addition and deck to an existing two-story building.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Commissioner Wheeler asked what kind of alley was there.

Ms. Jones stated that she believed it to be a subject alley, which ends at the spot where she took the photograph. She did not proceed further, not wishing to trespass.

Ms. Michelle Bebbs introduced herself on behalf of KERK Architects and the owner, also present.

Ms. Bebbs stated that the applicants would be open to adjusting window sizes and paint colors, and that the paint colors would be submitted with the final application.

Ms. Bebbs stated that there is no direct alley access at the back of the property, nor is there any back yard to speak of. Ms. Bebbs asked if it would be necessary to return for a final review, or if changes to the application could then be administratively approved. Commission Chair Johnson stated that the applicants would be called upon to return for a final review.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he requested Commission feedback on the project.

Commission Chair Johnson asked for Commission feedback.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he liked the direction the project was going and hoped that the project could be fast-tracked at the next meeting.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed agreement and added that the applicants could consider something more adventurous than Richmond rail, if they wished.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the applicants had skillfully incorporated ideas from other applications.

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.

10. [COA-089506-2021](#) 419-421 Brook Road - Rehabilitate an existing building and build a rooftop addition.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he would need to recuse himself from review of this application.

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The applicant, Mr. Walter Parks, stated that he did not have much to add but would be happy to answer any questions.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he requested that Commissioners share any feedback they may have.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he liked the project and found it a unique way to reuse a building. Commission Chair Johnson stated that staff comments were useful, and added that HVAC location information would be needed.

Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement and stated that he liked the way they pulled back the second floor and that it was an effective adaptation back to two-story use.

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 6:23 PM.