



City of Richmond

City Hall
900 East Broad Street

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, March 26, 2019

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Call to Order

James Klaus, the Chairman, called the March 26th meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:30 pm.

Roll Call

Present -- 9 - * Commissioner David C. Cooley, * Commissioner Sanford Bond, * Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, * Commissioner James W. Klaus, * Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., * Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, * Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, * Commissioner Sean Wheeler and * Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Approval of Minutes

January 15th, 2019 Quarterly Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, that the January 15, 2019 Quarterly Meeting minutes be approved.

Aye -- 8 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

January 22, 2019

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Morgan, that the January 22, 2019 Meeting minutes be approved.

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

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner David C. Cooley

February 26, 2019

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, that the February 26, 2019 Meeting minutes be approved.

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

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner David C. Cooley

Other Business

Secretary's Report

Ms. Carey Jones, Secretary to the Commission, stated that the next Quarterly Commission Meeting will be on April 9, with location yet to be determined. Commissioner Hendricks stated that his firm's offices could be made available. Ms. Jones stated that she is assembling an agenda, and asked that Commissioners send her any items that they would like included.

Chairman Klaus stated that a previously discussed item to follow up on is reviewing a section of the Old and Historic District Guidelines. Ms. Jones asked that Commissioners let her know of any Guidelines items of especial interest before the meeting.

Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones stated that the Administrative Approval Report was sent to Commissioners the preceding Friday, and asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Klaus stated that several DHR projects were on the Report, one of which – 2119 East Broad Street – the Commission had not reviewed, because it had been a repair and replace-in-kind application. Ms. Jones stated that items such as window replacements or signage will also be administratively approved, provided that they meet the Guidelines.

Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that she had little to report on the topic of enforcements.

Other Committee Reports

Chairman Klaus stated that the Urban Design Committee has no items to review for its April meeting, and that the Committee would use that time to consider changes to UDC guidelines.

Ms. Kim Chen, Principal Planner for the Division of Planning and Preservation, briefed the Commissioners about a project in the Springhill neighborhood that was conceptually reviewed by the Commission in March 2018, and came for final review in May 2018. In November 2018 staff denied building permits due to differences between plans approved and those presented to permitting staff. In January 2019 staff were reassigned the revised plans, which again did not reflect what the Commission approved. On February 4, 2019 after much consultation with CAR staff, the applicant submitted new plans CAR staff approved the revised plans on February 7th, 2019. On February 11, a neighbor reported that the foundation was significantly higher than in the approved plans. CAR staff visited

the property the next morning to confirm this and contacted the property owner. CAR staff have continued to meet with the property owner, who has been forthcoming and compliant. On February 21st staff issued a stop-work order and a notice of violation, so that existing problems with the construction would not be exacerbated. Concerned neighbors brought this to attention of City Council during the public comment period of the March 25, 2019 City Council meeting.

The building site has a 14-foot slope. The completed foundation is a foot higher in front than stated in the building plans. Staff feels that, if the owner does as much as possible to alleviate the height differential, the work done will be substantially in compliance with the Commission approved plans. Ms. Chen and Mr. Mark Olinger, the Director of the Department of Planning and Development Review, will be meeting with the City of Richmond Chief Administrative Officer.

Chairman Klaus asked if the roughness of the perspectival drawing submitted with the application had been an issue, and whether in future the Commission should require more rigorous drawings. Ms. Chen suggested this be discussed at the Quarterly Meeting, and also that Commissioners raise issues of grade discrepancy at Commission Meetings, if they see them at building sites. Ms. Chen stated that the variance in building height and style was mentioned in all reports related to the project.

Chairman Klaus asked if neighborhood associations are notified of pertinent applications which are going before the Commission. Ms. Jones stated that a hard copy letter is sent to all property owners within 150 feet; a notice is posted in the Richmond Times-Dispatch; and Ms. Jones emails meeting agendas to email lists which include neighborhood associations and individuals who have asked to be included. Mr. Klaus stated that therefore the Springhill Neighborhood Association's claim to have not been informed about the project would seem to be unfounded. Mr. Klaus stated that this did not come to light at the March 25 Council Meeting; also at the meeting it was stated, incorrectly, that the project had been placed on the Commission's consent agenda and that public comment was not invited.

The business portion of the meeting adjourned at 3:48 PM.

*****Please Note*****

Public comment on cases brought before the CAR will be heard after the applicant's explanatory remarks of the case and before CAR deliberation. Applicants and individuals wishing to comment on specific aspects of a given case are asked to briefly address issues related to the application.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Chairman invited the Commission to suggest projects that they would like to move from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. He explained to the applicants present that, if an application is placed on the consent agenda and they do not think it belongs there, they would have an opportunity to have it moved back to the regular agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 4th item, COA-050746-2019, 1006 West Franklin Street to the consent agenda. The Commission approved moving the item with all in favor except Commissioner Brewer abstaining.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 10th item, COA-050421-2019, 3315 East Marshall Street to the consent

agenda. Commissioners Cooley and Klaus pointed out that the Commission has in the past been able to assist applicants with locating suitable artisans for fabricating replacement columns. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Cooley seconding, to move the 3rd item, COA-050413-2019, 3202 Monument Avenue to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 7th item, COA-050176-2019, 807-809 North 24th Street to the consent agenda, with the added condition that the plans match the elevations, based on concerns raised by Commissioner Hendricks. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 8th item, COA-050178-2019, 418 North 23rd Street to the consent agenda. The Commission approved moving the item with all in favor except Commissioner Pearson who recused himself.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 11th item, COA-050432-2019, 19 North 29th Street to the consent agenda, with the clarification that of the two options presented, option two be approved. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus to move the 6th item, COA-050416-2019, 200 West Marshall Street, to the consent agenda. Commissioner Cooley expressed concern about loss of historical features, based on the fire escape placement. Ms. Jones stated that the plans provided are rough and that those features would be taken into account in final plans. The motion was withdrawn.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment concerning the items on the consent agenda.

Olga Jackson asked, in reference to item 11, that option one be considered, because the current railing is not historic and 90% of the porch would remain intact. Chairman Klaus stated that there is value in architectural features that at least allude to no longer extant historical details. Chairman Klaus stated that to consider option one, the Commission would probably have to move the item to the regular agenda. Ms. Jackson decided to stay with option two and keep the item on the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

1 [COA-050774-2019](#) 2100 East Clay Street- Demolish two brick piers.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

3 [COA-050413-2019](#) 3202 Monument Avenue- Replace existing front patio and walkway.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the walkway from the street to the front steps be paved with brick or red tile and the material and color to be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

4 [COA-050746-2019](#) 1006 West Franklin Street- Construct a new third floor addition.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the final cladding details, including material and colors, be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

7 [COA-050176-2019](#) 807-809 North 24th Street- Construct two new, semi-attached, single-family residences.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the bracket locations be revised on the building permit plans; and the applicant submit the following: a specification sheet for a window that meets the Commission Guidelines; revised porch detail materials; and revised plans that match the submitted elevations. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 8 [COA-050178-2019](#) 418 North 23rd Street- Construct a new single-family residence.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the following be submitted for staff review and approval: a revised front façade elevation with a middle column for the porch; a specification sheet for a window that meets the Commission Guidelines; and the applicant submit revised wood or composite porch detail materials. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 10 [COA-050421-2019](#) 3315 East Marshall Street- Replace decorative steel posts on front porch with wooden posts.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the engaged columns remain intact; the blocks that were built for the metal posts under the porch cornice also be removed; the new porch posts be wood and match the existing engaged columns, the design and color to be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; any decorative elements installed be wood and match the surviving sawn brackets and decorative elements on the engaged columns; if a railing is installed it match the historic design as shown in the 1950s photograph to include turned pickets, and be installed at the historic railing height. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 11 [COA-050432-2019](#) 19 North 29th Street- Partially enclose and screen-in a rear porch, and add glazing to an existing door.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: a railing element as shown in option two be installed with the details submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; and the existing cornice and columns be maintained and glazing be installed to the cornice and between the columns on the southwest elevation in a manner to be reviewed and administratively approved by staff to include the use of larger windows and/or transoms. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

REGULAR AGENDA

- 2 [COA-050399-2019](#) 1136 West Grace Street- Install metal paneling on existing portico.

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

This application was presented by Ms. Chelsea Jeffries.

As the alterations to the portico are not consistent with the Guidelines, staff recommended denial of the installation of metal paneling and recommended that the portico be returned to its historic appearance. Staff requested that the applicant submit elevations and a materials list for approval prior to beginning work on repairing the porch.

Mr. Steve Nordheim, the owner of the property, stated that he disagrees with staff recommendations, believes the work already done is aesthetically pleasing, and that the alteration was made to address wood rot. He added that the returns on the porch are unusual in the area and are conducive to wood rot; and that there are many examples of non-original details on other houses in the area.

Commissioner Cooley asked if the applicant had gotten a permit for the work done, and pointed out that time and money could have been saved had he done so.

Mr. Nordheim stated that he had not known the property was historic, or that the review

process was required.

Chairman Klaus stated his regret that Mr. Nordheim had not known, and explained that the Commission has an obligation to maintain the historic fabric, and that the Guidelines require that historic wooden features be repaired or replaced in kind.

Mr. Nordheim stated that he could also let the historic wooden features rot.

Chairman Klaus stated that this was his option, until it becomes a zoning or health and safety issue.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 9 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 5 [COA-050743-2019](#) 101 North 29th Street- Amend previously approved plans to alter the porch enclosure and garage.

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

This application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff provided an overview of the proposed changes from the Commission approved plans to the current application. Staff noted that a condition of approval for the previous application was that the column width of the porch enclosure be increased to be consistent with the existing columns on the historic porch (no longer extant). Staff requests the applicant provide information about the column width for staff review and approval.

Staff recommended the following originally approved details be maintained in the design: the faux railing on the second story; and the large glass panels on the connector between the main house and the porch enclosure.

Staff recommended approval of the following: Change in fenestration size of the first story porch enclosure windows, provided the applicant utilize a transom window to maintain the opening from the railing to the cornice; and relocation of the door and a solid wall on the garage addition.

Staff recommended denial of the following: a high brick parapet wall on the garage addition. Staff recommended that the requested brick parapet wall be lowered to align with the height of the first floor level, that a small brick base for the end column be incorporated into the plans, and that if a railing is required it be a cable railing as originally approved by the Commission at the September 2017 meeting.

The applicant, property owner Margaret Freund, stated that she is requesting adjustments to the design for technical reasons and due to historical photos she had not

yet researched at the time of the original application.

Jonathan Valalik, staff for the property owner, stated that the Sanborn map showing an historic second story porch is inaccurate, and that a photo from 1979 which doesn't show a porch should be treated as authoritative. He cited roof slope and a speculative no longer extant door as further support.

Commissioner Johnson asked for clarification to confirm that the applicant believed it was only a small section that was two stories.

Ms. Freund stated that in their opinion, rather than a full second story porch, there was a small enclosed area, and the full porch shown in a 1981 photo was not historic. Based on the 1979 photo, she stated that they are requesting the removal of the second story faux railing.

Commissioner Hendricks pointed out an alternate theory which was that the porch in the 1979 photo was under construction and Commissioner Bond agreed that this could be the case

Chairman Klaus pointed out that by requesting changes and positing the nonexistence of a second story porch, the applicants are opening themselves up to further concerns and recommendations from the Commission. Enclosing the porches as the application requests is already a stretch of the Guidelines and of neighbors' tolerance.

Commissioner Johnson pointed out that the applicants cannot pick and choose elements from various historic photos.

Ms. Freund stated several times "we didn't have this photo" referencing the 1979 photo. She brought to the Commissioners' attention a revised elevations she brought to the meeting, which was not included in their application materials and thus not publicly available. She stated that the faux railing does not work well with the design, but would be willing to add a horizontal element on the second story. She also stated that despite what is shown on the elevations submitted with the application, the plans for the connector between the historic house and the enclosed porches remains the same. She also wishes to simplify the façade of the garage, and incorporate a vertical element between the garage and the foundation of the home.

Ms. Freund requested that the Commission approve a two-story garage, basing this on a two-story carriage house shown in the 1979 photographic record. In regard to the eight-foot casement windows which were previously approved, Ms. Freund stated that she was unable to obtain them in a size larger than six feet. Ms. Freund asked if the Commission would be amenable to her meeting with Commission staff to generate ideas to bring back to the Commission and if staff could approve the changes.

Chairman Klaus asked if, due to the quantity of proposed revisions, Ms. Freund would like the current review to be a conceptual one, so that she could return for final review at a later meeting.

Ms. Freund stated that she did not want to do that.

Chairman Klaus stated that, in that case, the Commission would have to review what had been submitted in the application and make recommendations based on that, since the Commission cannot go through a design process with the applicant in the course of a meeting. Ms. Freund stated that the applicants could work with staff on a final design, to

which Chairman Klaus responded, not with this much change in the application.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Martha Broughton stated that she was present to speak for the neighbors living in the house attached to 101 North 29th Street, who were too upset to attend the meeting due to the collapse of the wall on the property, about which they had warned the applicants. She stated that they would like the design to remain as approved.

Ms. Nancy Lampert stated that she has no vested interest in the neighborhood in question, but that five applications for one property seemed to her like bullying of the Commission. She recommended that the Commission follow the staff recommendations. Ms. Lampert also stated that the applicant has some experience as a developer, and that custom windows can be made.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with staff recommendations and the additional conditions that a final drawing with exact specifications be provided, and that recessed trim be added to delineate old and new construction.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the argument that the Sanborn map is inaccurate is not convincing. She stated that Sanborn maps tend to be very accurate, and in this case obviate the ambiguous findings in the photo evidence.

Chairman Klaus stated his support for the staff recommendations, and that any details taken away at this point would erase the historic fabric, adding that the garage height was at the top of the railing on the first story porch.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that the garage is now new construction and added that he would be amenable to adding trim to differentiate it. Commissioner Pearson stated that the trim and moving the location of the door was part of the public-noticed application.

Commissioner Cooley asked if the windows are sliding or casement style. The applicant responded that they are casements. Ms. Morgan asked what the window material is. The applicant responded aluminum clad wood.

Commissioner Bond stated that without an already existing accurate drawing of the proposed revised plans, he could not get an adequate idea of the proposal and did not feel comfortable approving it.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye – 4 –Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Lane Pearson, and Commissioner James W. Klaus

No – 5 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner David Cooley, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Sanford Bond, and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the plans to accurately reflect the proposed revisions.

Attorney Andy Condlin stated on behalf of the applicant that they would prefer a denial to

a deferral.

Chairman Klaus asked if the project could be administratively approved if the applicants submit the desired specifications and changes to staff. Ms. Jones and Ms. Kim Chen pointed out that such a decision cannot be made via an email chain and cannot be made without public notice and public comment.

Commissioner Bond stated that eight foot casement windows are available.

Commissioner Johnson called the question, to end discussion and prompt an immediate vote.

The call to question carried by a unanimous vote.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that the applicant does have the option to move forward with the plans that were previously approved.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the plans to accurately reflect the proposed revisions. The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye --** 5 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson
- No --** 4 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

6 [COA-050416-2019](#) 200 West Marshall Street- Convert second story window into a door, and install a fire escape.

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

This application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff presented the proposed application and mentioned meetings she had with other City staff, including the Departments of Buildings and Public Works, in order to determine a recommendation.

Staff recommended approval of the application with the following conditions: that the new stairs be installed in a manner that does not damage the historic masonry, so that should they be removed in future the material integrity will not be diminished; the new door be submitted to staff for review and approval; the historic window be retained for future use; and revised elevation that accurately reflects the existing and proposed opening be submitted to staff.

Chairman Klaus expressed concern about partially filling in an historic window, that the original outline could be lost if the fill material blends in. Ms. Jones stated that the Commission could address this by adding a condition.

Commissioner Morgan asked if the fireproof door in the application would be a steel door. Ms. Jones stated that this was not specified, and falls under details that could be administratively approved.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the current application was part of a tax credit project. Ms. Jones stated that it was not, to her knowledge.

Bruce Vanderbilt, the property owner, stated that the building is a challenging triangular shape. A staircase has been relocated and has a large footprint due to the 17-foot height of the first floor. The applicant was unable to find a practical way to have an interior staircase for the second egress. The reason for the second egress is that it is required due to address the art gallery, a nonconforming use.

Mr. Vanderbilt stated that he had wanted to use the hayloft opening on the property, but building code makes this challenging. In addition, two ADA bathrooms are being installed on the second floor and take up more space than they normally would due to the triangular building shape. The proposed conversion of a window to a door for the fire escape was arrived at in light of these challenges.

In explaining the submitted plan, Mr. Vanderbilt stated that he would be working with an engineer to get this plan finalized. He also stated the intention of raising the lower landing, so that the fire escape would not block a window it currently is blocking in the plans. Raising the fire escape would also prevent it from being easily reached by passersby. These alterations would all be within inches.

Commissioner Cooley asked about the composition of the fire door.

Mr. Vanderbilt stated it would be steel, and would be administratively approved by staff. Commissioners discussed the possibility of an historic patterning for the door, if such exists.

Commissioner Hendricks asked if there would be an elevator installed in the building; Mr. Vanderbilt stated that there would not.

Commissioner Hendricks asked if the building is fully sprinklered.

Mr. Vanderbilt stated that it is.

Commissioner Hendricks said it should therefore be possible to shrink the fire escape.

In discussing possible alterations so that the hayloft door could be used, Mr. Vanderbilt told Commissioner Hendricks that the ADA bathrooms configuration prevents this, and that he had tried to get a code modification to have only one ADA bathroom, but was told this was very unlikely.

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

Commissioner Morgan expressed appreciation that the applicant had explored alternatives, and asked that the arch at the opening be retained.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed hesitation about the application, stating that fire escapes are not generally allowed in new construction because they are considered unsafe; and also that the proposed one would be in a public right of way. Chairman Klaus stated that he felt every option had been explored.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he felt the hayloft opening could be used for the fire escape, if the top landing were lengthened.

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the new stairs be installed in a manner that does not damage the historic masonry, so that should they be removed in future the material integrity will not be diminished; the new door be submitted to staff for review and approval; the historic window be retained for future use; a revised elevation that accurately reflects the existing and proposed openings be submitted to staff; the infill masonry for the window be differentiated from the historic; and the arched opening for the window be maintained. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr. and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

No -- 3 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

9 [COA-050750-2019](#) 2007 Cedar Street- Construct a new, multi-family residence.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff recommended approval of the application with the following conditions: that a single, shed roof dormer be utilized over the balconies and a single dormer on the outer bay to maintain visual balance, and that this design change be submitted for staff review and approval; that the stepped parapet be removed from the right side elevation and the slope of the side wall be increased to meet the false mansard roof; and that the window materials be submitted to staff for review and approval.

The applicant, Zach Kennedy, stated that he felt that issues raised by the Commission in previous reviews had been addressed, and that the windows to be submitted to staff for approval would not present a problem.

Chairman Klaus informed Mr. Kennedy that the Commission made a correction about six months previous in regard to some window types that they had been mistakenly approving.

Chairman Klaus asked if any of the staff recommendations would be problematic.

Mr. Kennedy stated, in regard to the parapet, that the roof slopes in such a way that gaps for scuppers would have to be added for drainage.

Commissioner Hendricks offered solutions to address the water flow from the roof.

Chairman Klaus asked for any public comment.

Nancy Lampert stated her concern about the height and massing of the proposed building and its effect on the character of the district.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for Commission discussion and a motion.

Chairman Klaus commended the applicant for his responsiveness to Commission concerns and recommendations.

Commissioner Hendricks proposed a friendly amendment that the parapet be kept as low as possible.

The architect Mario DiMarco stated that the parapet height is to conceal HVAC equipment.

Commissioner Hendricks expressed agreement with staff's concern about the balance of the façade, but reservations about staff stepping into a design role in their suggestions.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: a single, shed roof dormer be utilized over the balconies on the façade and a window on the outer bay to maintain visual balance to be submitted for staff review and approval; the stepped parapet on the right side elevation be kept as low as possible and the slope of the side wall be increased to meet the false mansard roof; and the window materials be submitted to staff for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 5 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

No -- 3 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

12 [COA-050780-2019](#) 2901 M Street- Construct two new, semi-attached, multi-family residences.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff recommended deferral of the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to provide additional design details and to resolve the zoning requirements. Staff recommended that the applicant either consider a design with traditional massing, proportions, and exterior details, or consider incorporating modern design elements that reference the architectural language of the surrounding area. Staff requested the applicant provide additional details including: dimensioned elevations for all sides of the buildings, a context elevation, a door and window schedule, and specifications about the proposed materials.

In response to Commissioner Wheeler's questions, Ms. Jones stated that the applicant no longer has plans to demolish an historic house on the property, and that any work proposed to be done to that house would be in a separate future application.

The architect for the project, Patrick Zampetti, stated that the property owner is concerned about the Commission's request from an earlier review that the internal garages not be included. Mr. Zampetti stated that another house nearby has an internal garage. Mr. Zampetti expressed disagreement about staff's recommendation of a low slope mansard roof, stating this is not in keeping with styles of the neighborhood. Mr. Zampetti stated that the proposed dormers are in proportion with the neighboring house. Mr. Zampetti objected to staff's request for a window schedule, as these are not required of all applicants; he also stated that context and dimensioned elevations had been included in the application, contrary to what staff stated. Mr. Zampetti stated that staff were asking for a design to go to one of two extremes, either modern or in keeping with neighborhood styles; but he did not feel that staff's suggestion of a was appropriate. He has observed larger rectangular buildings with porches in the neighborhood and this is what he is proposing. Mr. Zampetti stated that he felt the proposed design is human scale and not as divergent from local styles as staff stated.

Referring to applicant Margaret Freund bringing additional documents to the meeting, Mr. Zampetti asked why he was not allowed to add documents after the application submission deadline.

Chairman Klaus and Ms. Jones stated that the deadline is a firm one, but that applicants do sometimes bring additional documents to the meeting, though these have not been made available to the public.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that the window schedule is requested when the Commission needs clarification of window sizes, particularly when they look small or out of proportion. Commissioner Hendricks stated that the proposed dormer sizes refer to the adjacent Cape style house, but the design under review is not a Cape style and thus the optimal size would be different.

Chairman Klaus stated that, since the internal garages are not part of the currently proposed design, if the property owner strongly desires them this would be a reason to defer.

Mr. Zampetti asked if internal garages are forbidden in the area; Chairman Klaus stated that they are not forbidden, and there are some examples of them, but that they are not commonly approved.

Mr. Zampetti stated that zoning regulations require off-street parking.

Commissioner Cooley asked why windows are not included on the side elevations in the plans submitted. Mr. Zampetti stated that this was his omission, and that he does intend to include side windows. Mr. Cooley further stated that the windows on the façade appear small.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Martha Broughton stated that the proposed building's roof form would be arresting, but are good.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for Commission

discussion and a motion.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that the lack of side windows shown in the plans was one of the reasons to defer. Chairman Klaus stated that the material to add to the application would not be very substantial, and that the applicant might wish to revise the roof form somewhat in reference to the new construction across the street, which the Commission generally likes.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that, if a garage is added, it should be one story and subservient to the main structure.

Commissioner Morgan advised that the applicant steer away from traditional designs, for example two-over-two windows.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that other Commissioners may not be in agreement with Commissioner Wheeler about the garage.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that it would be desirable to have some element, beside the windows, on the west elevation that refers to the existing neighboring house.

Chairman Klaus encouraged the applicant to meet with staff and take advantage of their input and advice.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to allow the applicant the opportunity to provide additional design details. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner David C. Cooley, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused -- 2 - Commissioner Sanford Bond and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 13 [COA-050433-2019](#) 411 North 22nd Street- Construct a new, single-family residence.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff informed the Commission that the applicant has applied to the Board of Zoning Appeals to waive the three-foot setback requirement for both side yards. The Board of Zoning Appeals will hear the case at the May 1st, 1:00 PM meeting. If the Board of Zoning Appeals denies the applicant's request, the width of the house will need to be reduced to fourteen feet and the applicant will need to return to the Commission with revised plans. Staff also explained to the Commission about the adjacent alley held in common by the neighbors on East Marshall Street.

Staff recommended against the internal garage. Staff acknowledges that zoning

regulations require a parking space for new residential construction; however, the space is not required to be internal to the building. Staff recommends the applicant reduce the length of the house to be more in keeping with the general patterns in the neighborhood to allow for a parking space at the rear of the property. Staff recommended the following design changes: reconsider the interior spaces and incorporate a more aligned fenestration pattern on the visible bays of the side elevations; narrow the front porch stairs and move the middle column closer to the door so that it is aligned with the space between the door and the middle window rather than blocking the middle window; removal of the window keystone and corbels to simplify the decorative details to be in keeping with the surrounding architectural character; removal of the second story porch on the façade as it is not a common feature on single-family homes in the district.

Staff requested additional information for the following: the proposed window materials; the location of the HVAC equipment be shown on a roof plan, and elevations and proposed screening options if required.

Staff had concerns with the existing topography on the site and requested a topographic survey and information on how the applicant will address the change of grade at the rear of the property.

Staff noted that the elevations are mislabeled and requested the applicant update the labels for final review.

Chairman Klaus asked about an alley near the property: who owns it and whether the city would resurface it. It was determined that the neighbors present at the meeting would be able to respond to this.

The applicant, Enoch Pou, stated that he would be amenable to moving the middle column and shortening the steps as requested by staff.

Mr. Pou argued in favor of the proposed two-story front porch, stating that such porches exist within a two-block radius from the property, and that the upper porch provides a view and compensates for the small house size.

Mr. Pou stated, in regard to the proposed architectural details, his concern is that the house would be excessively plain. He requested greater specificity as to how best to simplify the appearance.

Mr. Pou responded to staff request for window alignment, listing several windows in the design which he stated are aligned, and stating that some of the transom windows could be full windows if the Commission wishes. Mr.

Pou stated that the west elevation faces the rear of neighboring properties on West Marshall, and expressed doubt that the neighbors would care about the window appearance from there.

Mr. Pou addressed staff's recommendation that the house be reduced in size to allow rear parking, stating that a guywire prevents onsite non-garage parking, and that the house is already very small.

Chairman Klaus asked whether the power company could be asked to move a guywire. Commissioners Cooley and Brewer confirmed that this could be done, provided one paid for it.

Mr. Pou stated that he could not understand staff's recommendation that any internal garage door openings be screened with a wall and/or vegetation.

Mr. Pou stated that additional fenestration above a garage door could be done, as requested by staff.

Mr. Pou stated that window information had been provided to staff; however, the applicant had erred in labeling the windows incorrectly in the plans.

Mr. Pou stated that HVAC equipment would be placed in the southwest corner of the roof, and asked that Commission and staff direct the applicant as to what type of screening they would like to be used, and that the applicant would comply.

Mr. Pou stated that the requested topographical survey should not be necessary, asserting that the site is mostly level up to the guywire location, beyond which the property would be fenced. Mr. Pou stated that the plan is to make the property level and to make the brick wall and the foundation be of the same height.

Mr. Pou stated that an application is currently before the BZA for a zoning variance to allow a 3-foot setback on the opposite side yard, as opposed to the required 6 feet.

Commissioner Hendricks asked what Mr. Pou knew about the aforementioned alley. Mr. Pou stated he had no knowledge of it.

Commissioner Brewer asked why there was no kitchen window on the east elevation. Mr. Pou stated that this was for reasons of security. Chairman Klaus mentioned the option of putting curtains in place.

Commissioner Cooley asked if Mr. Pou would be amenable to putting a roof over the proposed second story porch. Mr. Pou stated that he would be.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Bill Hartsock, owner and resident of 2202 East Marshall Street, stated that the alley mentioned earlier is owned jointly by himself and the owners of 2206 and 2208 East Marshall Street. Mr. Hartsock stated that the alley shown as flat in the applicant's plans is not, and that the applicant would have to either flatten the alley, or change the grade of the house to match the alley. Given the grade, Mr. Hartsock stated that a retaining wall might be necessary to protect nearby properties.

Mr. Hartsock stated that the guywire location is also inaccurate in the plans, falling in actuality halfway through where the plans show the garage door. He also stated that the HVAC equipment as proposed would be visible from nearby properties. Mr. Hartsock stated that the proposed fence would be superfluous, and that the proposed garage would be incongruous in the neighborhood, and also difficult to use given the space constraints, the incline, and the use of the alley by utility companies. Mr. Hartsock stated that the proposed 3 foot setback would not be workable. Mr. Hartsock stated that the plans submitted are misleading, that there is an additional guywire across the street, and that a retaining wall would have to be built. Mr. Hartsock added that he wrote a letter to the owners and Mr. Pou and did not receive a response.

John Flores, resident of 2206 East Franklin Street, stated agreement with Mr. Hartsock, adding that there is a persistent sinkhole in the sidewalk which an engineer should examine.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for Commission

comments.

Chairman Klaus stated that the Commission of Architectural Review has a limited purview and that zoning staff can still reject an application after it is approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Hendricks recommended simplifying some of the details, such as the corbel in the center; being mindful of the cornice, that it line up with the window edges; getting the site topographically surveyed. Commissioner Hendricks stated that he would be supportive with the proposed front double porch, and expressed uncertainty about the enclosed garage and suggested that it be separated somewhat from the main building, e.g., by a notch. Commissioner Hendricks noted that the proposed garage is wider than usual. Mr. Pou stated that the garage door is 10 feet wide because there is a 12 foot common alley. Commissioner Hendricks stated that garages in 12 foot alleys have been approved, but typically with a 3 foot offset; he stated that with the wider opening proposed, it should be workable, but also expressed concern about a car fitting in at that depth. Commissioner Hendricks recommended removing the keystone detail as being out of place in wood construction, and in general simplifying the details.

Ms. Chen pointed out that this portion of the meeting is not a dialogue with the applicant, but a chance for the Commissioners to state their opinions for the applicant.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed agreement with Commissioner Hendricks, including moving the column, adding that a fourth column could possibly be added; and the need for a topographical survey. Commissioner Wheeler suggested putting a stair near the entry, rather than the proposed wide U-shaped stair at the back – this would allow pulling the garage closer to the street, and potentially putting the garage on the back face, not facing the public way.

Commissioner Johnson expressed curiosity to see what zoning staff would say about the project.

Commissioner Brewer concurred with other Commission comments, reiterating the need for visual separation of the garage from the main building. Commissioner Brewer stated agreement with staff comments about window alignment and size consistency; and stated that she does not mind the double porch.

Commissioner Cooley commented that earth moving and retention would be significant for this project, and that dealing with neighbors would be a part of it. Commissioner Cooley stated that he does not mind the decorative façade; that the proposed garage is unique; and that the front porch needs a roof.

Commissioner Morgan expressed disagreement with Commissioner Cooley regarding the front porch roof, stating that it is not necessary; expressed agreement with staff that the decorative details are excessive and constitute a false historicism which is counter to the Guidelines; and expressed concern with the narrowness of the proposed house.

Commissioner Morgan asked for clarification regarding the setbacks. Mr. Pou stated that regulations require a 3-foot setback on both sides, which would reduce the house size to 14 feet. To preserve the 17-foot size, a zoning variance is being sought.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the small house size is a challenge and requires delicate detailing; and that bringing back the garage, separating it visually, is a good idea.

Chairman Klaus stated that he is in favor of less decoration; recommended using

high-quality materials to enhance the building's appearance; and emphasized the importance of addressing the topography and working with neighbors to do so.

Chairman Klaus disagreed with Mr. Pou's statement regarding windows facing the back of neighbors' property, stating that the neighbors will care, and that the windows should be symmetrical.

Chairman Klaus stated that plans submitted for final review will have to show a clear articulation of grade, and how it relates the property in question to its neighbors.

Chairman Klaus stated that internal garages are generally though not always denied; and that if there is a way to make it look like an outbuilding that would make it appropriate for the area.

Mr. Pou stated that he would be willing to build a retaining wall on the property. Regarding visual separation of the garage from the main structure, Mr. Pou asked if an inset at the east elevation would address the issue.

Chairman Klaus stated that some measure to make the garage appear separate is generally called for by the

Commission, though the details are for the architects to work out.

Regarding the architectural details, Mr. Pou asked if the corbels beneath the crossheads should be removed. Commissioner Hendricks stated that simplification is generally wished for, and that this could potentially include a different, smaller corbel.

Mr. Pou asked if the Commission has any problem with the footprint of the house.

Chairman Klaus stated that this is up to zoning staff to determine.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the proposed house is too narrow.

Chairman Klaus stated that Sanborn maps show a house of similar footprint in the lot in the past; whether zoning regulations have changed since is another matter.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.

14 [COA-050408-2019](#) 2311 Carrington Street- Construct a new, single-family residence.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff recommended that the applicant consider a front porch instead of a landing/entry stoop. Staff also recommended that the applicant consider setting the house further back to allow space for perpendicular stairs.

Staff recommended that the applicant consider a more consistent size and alignment for the fenestration pattern on the right side elevation, which will be highly visible across the adjacent vacant parcel.

Staff recommended that the applicant reduce the mix of patterns and materials, and

consider alternate ways to add visual interest to the design

Staff recommended that the applicant vertically align the windows to be in keeping with the patterns established in the surrounding area.

Staff requested that the location of the HVAC equipment be submitted for final review.

Staff requested that additional window specifications be submitted for final review.

Staff noted the exterior finish schedule is not consistent with the narrative text and requested the applicant update this for final review.

Staff asked that the following be submitted for final review: a fully dimensioned context site plan and elevations; and a door and window schedule with updated material specifications that meet the Guidelines.

The owner and developer Amanda Seibert introduced herself and explained that she lives and is building and renovating extensively in the vicinity of the proposed house.

Ms. Seibert stated that the style of the house is an attempt at an interesting design which is clearly modern, not falsely historic, and blends stylistic references; and that the height is part of an overall scheme to build houses of varied heights in the area.

Ms. Seibert stated that the stoop was arrived at in an attempt to create balance with the rest of the design, but that she would be happy to add stairs or set the house back further if that is deemed important. Ms. Seibert stated that she plans to build three detached houses across the street, with a false mansard design that will speak to the design of the one under review.

Ms. Seibert explained that one of the side elevations of the house does not have windows due to its nearness to an existing house, and that the side elevation windows non-alignment is due to the floor plan, which on the first floor could be flipped although this would not be ideal.

There was no public comment.

Chairman Klaus expressed agreement with most of the staff comments, stating that all houses in the area have front porches with stairs going to the street, and lack of them makes this house look alien; the chevron is problematic but might work in a revised design; and the window variation and alignment on the side elevation does need to be addressed but that it shouldn't be too difficult.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he would like there to be a porch but that it needn't be full width; that he liked the recess; that there is too much variety of materials and details; that he does not like the chevron; and that he is not concerned about the side windows, as they will be blocked from view when the planned additional buildings are built.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he likes the front elevation as is, except that he would make the front stairs go off straight, perpendicular to the building, and add a small eyebrow across the top of the recess so as to divert drainage so it does not run down the siding. Commissioner Wheeler suggested opening up the façade by having a three-foot lot line on one side and zero lot line on the other, as opposed to 1 ½' and 1 ½' as planned.

Commissioner Johnson expressed appreciation that the applicant had done something different with the design; advised paying close attention to the alignment of the fronts of the houses; and agreed with Commissioner Wheeler about the eyebrow over the recessed porch.

Commissioner Brewer stated that she appreciated the unusual design, but that it is too busy with vertical and horizontal elements and the chevron, and suggested keeping two out of three of those features. Commissioner Brewer stated that the porch is important; expressed concern about the expanse of siding on the side elevations, although allowing that they will not be highly visible. She suggested that one way to improve the sides would be to align the kitchen window and the bedroom window.

Commissioner Cooley stated support for adding a porch roof, for protection from the elements. Commissioner Cooley stated that he did not find the chevron element of the design to be a problem.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she does not find the chevron a problem; expressed agreement with Commissioner Brewer about slightly reducing elements on the front elevation. Commissioner Morgan stated that the front light fixture is distracting and somewhat incongruous; and that she is not concerned about how the house sits on the lot, as setbacks in the immediate neighborhood are extremely varied, and this is part of its unique appeal.

Ms. Seibert stated that she felt the house was lined up with a neighboring house to the left, and asked how much further back was desirable. Commissioner Klaus and others responded that it does not need to be moved back, just that the setback should be the same as the rest of the street. Chairman Klaus stated that some commissioners had thought the house might have to be moved back to accommodate the requested front stairs, but that he did not believe this to be correct.

Ms. Seibert asked whether, if details such as the chevron are included in the final review version but are denied by Commission, that this adjustment could be made at that time in the conditions. Chairman Klaus confirmed that this could be done.

Chairman Klaus stated that in general the Commission seemed to be in favor of simplifying, and of adding a porch.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

- 15 [COA-050423-2019](#) 2816 East Franklin Street- Demolish a one-story, masonry garage, and construct a new, two-story accessory building.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Staff found that the existing building has experienced significant modification over time and recommended that the Commission may wish to consider whether the building retains enough integrity to be deemed contributing to the historic character of the district.

Staff recommended that the new building should be constructed of one material, such as

brick, to be consistent with two-story outbuildings in the district. Staff asked that the following should be submitted for final review: an analysis by a structural engineer; and window specifications.

Todd Dykshorn, the architect for the project, introduced himself and stated that the staff report seemed thorough. Mr. Dykshorn stated that the owner is a sailboat hobbyist, and that the existing garage is in poor condition, with a cracked slab, and also that it is too narrow for any modern vehicles. The garage plan would be to use the main floor as a work space, and have a small upper floor space for office and occasional bedroom use. A special use permit is being sought from the Board of Zoning Appeals, and Mr. Dykshorn is also checking with zoning staff about this planned usage of the upper space. The planned double doors for the garage are to allow a boat to be pulled in.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the boxy two-story structure was seen as fitting in with other structures in the neighborhood, with the brick first story being a nod to extant 1-story brick garages nearby.

Chairman Klaus asked if the historic brick of the existing structure could be used for the new building; Mr. Dykshorn stated that this was the plan, and that there should be enough reclaimable brick to do the whole first floor.

Mr. Dykshorn stated that the existing garage used to be half of a two-bay building, before that half was torn down.

Commissioner Hendricks expressed hesitation about tearing down the historic garage, as that is something the Commission tries to avoid.

Commissioner Wheeler noted that the window elevation show a double-hung window. Mr. Dykshorn clarified that it would be a casement window.

Chairman Klaus asked if the building could be shorter than the planned 20 feet. Mr. Dykshorn stated that it could be 1-2 feet shorter, adding that the 20 foot height represents a parapet on three of the four sides. Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Karen Jones, resident of 2809 East Grace Street, which shares an alley with the building, stated that she is concerned about the height of the proposed building and its effect on the tone of the alley. She also expressed concern about the proposed dwelling on the upper floor and its possible use as a rental. As the entry would be to the alley, the alley would become a street address, which Ms. Karen Jones stated would be a bad precedent. She also stated that she does not like the proposed steel for the upper story.

Chairman Klaus stated that the proposed use is beyond the purview of the Commission. Ms. Jones and Ms. Jeffries stated that this falls under Land Use and Zoning, specifically that a Special Use Permit is required for the proposed kitchen and bathroom.

Nancy Lampert stated that the Commission previously approved a two-story accessory dwelling on Venable and Burton, and that the height and massing of this structure became a considerable obstruction.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for Commission comments.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he liked the design of the proposed structure,

including the siding, and that there is precedent for two-story structures in the area. He stated that he had questions about the direction of the roof drainage, and the window.

Commissioner Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler, but that he would prefer brick facing on both stories.

Commissioner Brewer stated that the proposed structure seemed big, but that there is precedent for a two-story garage. She stated that she likes the differentiation between floors, but would prefer a different material than the metal shingles.

Commissioner Cooley stated that he likes the idea of reusing the old bricks and differentiating the upper and lower levels; and that he would have to factor neighborhood opposition into any decision.

Commissioner Morgan stated that she is okay with the building being two stories, but recommended shortening the height if possible. She stated that she likes the brick on the first floor. Commissioner Morgan added a note to Commission that the Guidelines regarding garages can be misleading and should be looked over at the next quarterly meeting.

Chairman Klaus expressed agreement that the two stories should be allowed, but stated that the applicant should tend toward the minimum allowable height, as opposed to maximum. Chairman Klaus stated that historic two-story garages would have been shorter than 20 feet, and that it is important that accessory buildings appear secondary to the primary building. Regarding concerns about demolition, Chairman Klaus stated that there is not enough of the historic garage to be worth keeping, and that the reuse of the brick would be good. Chairman Klaus stated that the Commission would need to see a sample of the proposed steel shingle material.

Commissioner Hendricks suggested that the historic brick be reused on the alley side first, and that he would acquiesce to the demolition of the existing building.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

- 17 [COA-050218-2019](#) 962-964 Pink Street- Construct two new, single-family attached residences.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff recommended a full-width front porch that spans the width of the building, which is more consistent with other examples of semi-attached houses in the district.

Staff recommended that the applicant reconsider the fenestration pattern of the façade to be a three-bay configuration which is more in keeping with the properties in the surrounding historic district.

Staff recommended the applicant consider a more consistent fenestration on the south elevation, which will be highly visible due to the adjacent alley, and on the visible bays of the north elevation. Staff further recommended the applicant utilize a standard size window on the visible south elevation.

Staff recommended the fence be constructed of wood.

Staff recommended wood or paintable composite materials be used, not the vinyl proposed for some architectural details (risers, railings, etc.).

Staff asked that the following should be submitted for final review: a fully dimensioned context site plan and elevations; and a door and window schedule with material specifications.

Mario DiMarco, architect for the project, introduced himself and the owner, Michael Magnes.

Mr. DiMarco stated that the material issues raised by staff, including the windows, would be easy to solve. Referring to staff's suggestion that the twin porches be made into one, Mr. DiMarco stated that the design was an attempt to not mimic a nearby house.

Mr. DiMarco that design decisions were driven by the internal aspects of the structure: two single-family homes with different owners with varying needs and sensibilities. The triple window which staff expressed reservations about is an extension of an open modern internal design. Mr. DiMarco stated that making a projecting bay window into a porch would be much less functional than the proposed design.

Referring to the side elevation, Mr. DiMarco stated that he has seen similar side elevations many times. He stated that all the windows have the same height, and most are the same size; the deviations are for the kitchen sink area and the u-shaped stair. The stair window if modified would overlap with a landing. Mr. DiMarco stated that the fenestration does not look so haphazard as to be distracting.

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

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he is okay with the front façade, but that a final plan should show the gutters and downspouts, as these will be problematic. He expressed agreement with staff comments regarding the side elevation fenestration pattern. Commissioner Wheeler stated that, if the stair window cannot be aligned, a skylight could be considered; that half-round or box gutters should be used, rather than k-style; and that hitting or obscuring the front porch columns with downspouts should be avoided.

Commissioner Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler, reiterating that water drainage needs to be addressed. Commissioner Johnson stated that he likes the double front porches design.

Commissioner Brewer expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler. Commissioner Brewer stated that the Commission generally asks that windows be aligned and be of similar sizes; that the staircase window should be removed from the design; and that the kitchen window should be aligned as much as possible.

Commissioner Cooley stated that he likes the double front porch design. Commissioner Cooley stated that the side elevation fenestration should be aligned as much as possible, but stated that alignment is not always workable. Commissioner Cooley also noted that porch roof connection could cause problems with the water draining.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the Commission has been asking applicants to include second-floor windows corresponding to the first floor windows, and recommended the

applicant do that in this case. Commissioner Morgan suggested that the elevations should be revised based on the modern open floor plan, and that they should not be in conflict.

Chairman Klaus commented that, since the applicant would like to include modern elements such as the triple window, the design could go more in this direction and be more identifiably modern.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the Guidelines offer insight on new construction, and that a delicate balance can be achieved between personal taste and the Guidelines. Commissioner Morgan suggested that the applicant avoid misleading reproduction of elements of other buildings, e.g., six-panel doors, two-over-two windows, and the dentil detailing.

Chairman Klaus stated that the applicant should design as they see fit, but that the Commission does tend to encourage an applicant with modern design elements in their new construction to go more in that direction, so that the modern appearance is clear. Chairman Klaus stated that he has not seen a window arrangement like the triple window in the submitted design. He suggested that there is a way to do it that would appear more typical.

Commissioner Hendricks suggested that flipping the dishwasher and the sink would allow alignment of the kitchen window; stated that he has no objection to the triple window; and suggested that the cornice brackets and the window edges be lined up.

The owner, Michael Magnes, stated that spacing windows, as some Commission members are requesting that the triple window be separated and spaced, often means that one of the windows is non-functioning, e.g., going into a closet. Mr. Magnes requested clarification about using the language of historical architectural elements while designing a building with a more modern sensibility.

Chairman Klaus stated that the architectural vocabulary being employed – dentil moldings, windows of historic size – is being used in unusual ways, but that the design does not go beyond historic vernacular other than with the triple window feature.

Mr. Magnes stated that the window placement is dictated by function, and asked that the Commission be understanding of that.

Mr. DiMarco asked for clarification about the roofline, and whether the Commission is asking that the roof be unified with a gap between, or if something else was meant. Mr. DiMarco expressed concern that the house would end up identical to one down the street, which he does not want to do.

Commissioner Cooley stated that with the proposed porch lines, drainage would be into a choke point, whereas traditionally a porch roof would run straight across. Mr. DiMarco responded that he should have made the gap between porch lines wider to facilitate drainage.

Mr. DiMarco stated that the floor plan is partly dictated by internal use of exposed brick, and that he would attempt to address the window issues via both elimination and addition.

Chairman Klaus stated that it is a matter of fine-tuning, and that the Commission understands form follows function, but must still abide by the Guidelines.

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed

Adjournment

Chairman Klaus adjourned the meeting at 8:07 PM.