



City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street
2nd Floor of City Hall
Richmond, VA 23219
www.richmondgov.com

Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, August 25, 2015

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

2 Roll Call

Present: 8 - Sanford Bond, Matthew Elmes, Bryan Green, Joseph Yates, Gerald Jason Hendricks, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Nathan Hughes and Joshua Bilder

Absent: 1 - Jennifer Wimmer

3 Approval of Minutes

ID 15-008 July 28, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: July 28, 2015 Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Bond, seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, that the minutes from the July 28, 2015 meeting be approved.

Aye: 5 - Bond, Green, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

Excused: 2 - Elmes and Hendricks

Abstain: 1 - Hughes

4 Other Business

Secretary's Report

*Mr. Green recused from the Southern Biscuit Nomination

National Register Nomination

Ms. Chen presented the National Register Nomination for the Southern Biscuit Company. Ms. Chen stated that this nomination is eligible under criterion A and criterion C because of its association with the distribution functions of the Southern Biscuit Company.

Ms. Chen stated that staff is recommending approval of the nomination.

Ms. Chen presented the National Register Nomination for the Wicker Apartments on Chamberlayne Avenue and that it was nominated under a multiple property designation for garden style apartments. Ms. Chen stated that it is significant under criterion B for its association with local builder and developer Earl H. Wicker, and under criterion C because they characterize the essential principles of FHA garden style apartments. Ms. Chen stated that they recommend approval of the nomination.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the nomination was only for the Biscuit building. Ms. Lisa Bricker stated that is correct.

Public discussion closed.

Mr. Elmes stated that he believes that Southern Biscuit meets the criteria that was listed in the applications.

Mr. Bond stated that he moves that the Commission support this nomination.

Mr. Yates stated that the only reason this is being requested is that the people who owned the original building which is a handsome industrial building did not own this building at the same time. Mr. Yates stated that he knows it meets the criteria but that it was a cinderblock warehouse building when it was built and that it has no architectural significance whatsoever. Mr. Yates stated that the only significance it has is that it was a building that was built by the Southern Biscuit Company and that it was a warehouse when it was built and that there is nothing that makes it eligible for the National Registry in his opinion. Mr. Yates stated that he is not in support of the expansion of the district to include this building.

Mr. Bond stated that he feels like a warehouse is part of an industrial complex and that it is a perfectly legitimate part of the operation of the Southern Biscuit Company. Mr. Bond stated that he thinks that it should be supported. Mr. Bond stated that the National Registry does support industrial buildings and warehouse buildings.

Mr. Yates stated that this building has no architectural merit and that he see no reason to distinguish it by adding it to the register.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it was more about the complex and that the facility has no architectural significance, however it helps complete the picture of the industrial process.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to support the application for the Southern Biscuit Company for a boundary increase as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-1-0 (Yates opposed).

Mr. Yates made a motion to support the application for the Wicker Apartment for inclusion on the National Registry. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 7-0-0.

Secretary Report

Mr. Hill stated that they have heard from Ms. Pitts and that they named their new baby Tafton James Pitts. They anticipate Ms. Pitts coming back early in October, possibly October 7th. Mr. Hill stated that they haven't heard anything about the Springhill appeal as to whether or not any member of City Council has agreed to sponsor a paper and that they completed the response within the time period. Mr. Hill stated that Council doesn't hold any meetings this month and that they may hear something in early September about that.

Mr. Green inquired about the timeframe within which someone has to support that. Mr. Hill stated that the 75 days begins at the initial appeal when it's filed and that by the time they respond within the 15 days there is 60 days or 2 months left and that they haven't heard any response or interest or questions about it. Mr. Hill states that if no one responds to the appeal it will expire in 75 days. Mr. Hill stated that in the case of the

other appeal, they have asked them what are the next steps that they need to do and that they have a subcommittee that has been working on trying to advise. Mr. Hill stated that it is a difficult situation and that the whole point of the application was unpainted masonry and they have had a hard time removing the primer and it was unsuccessful. Mr. Hill stated that they are keeping pace with the permits that come in and making sure that they adhere to the standards of the things they can approve administratively or for projects that have come before the Commission. Mr. Hill stated that the plans submitted are consistent with the plans that the Commission approved. Mr. Hill stated that they are requiring applicants to read and sign a statement that they have been informed and acknowledged their responsibilities in an Old and Historic District.

Mr. Hill stated that the enforcement calls are coming fast and they are working hard to keep up with them and that they have had some instances where people abated the incidences or got in touch with staff to see what they have to do. Mr. Hill stated that they had 3 or 4 instances where the people did attempt to abate the violation and they were able to verify it and remove the violation.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Hill distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 34 approvals for the period from July 28, 2015 through August 21, 2015.

Enforcement Report

No enforcement report was given.

Other Committee Reports

Annual Report

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the report is on hold until October.

Mr. Hill stated that the Commission will notice a couple of things about their presentations and that they are attempting to streamline this a little bit because the members already have the materials and staff reports. Mr. Hill stated that they will briefly touch on the content but that they will take them through every element of the project and will have the context shots. Mr. Hill stated that each presentation will end with a slide that has the staff recommendations along with any conditions.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they were keeping the plans and elevations and Mr. Hill stated yes.

UDC Report

Mr. Green stated that they had a special meeting last week regarding the BRT project and thanked all the members for helping put the letter together. Mr. Green stated that the project is at the 30 percent stage and that they recommended that they keep the lanes 10ft and that the stations be located in the median instead of the curb and that there be less thickness of the stations.

Mr. Hill stated that they received three letters of comments for 3607 E. Broad Street.

Mr. Green stated that the other letters were for agenda item #11 for 613 N. 28th Street and agenda item #17 for 2108 ½ E. Broad Street.

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion move item # 9 from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 5-2-0 (Elmes and Green opposed).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to remove item #14 for 2302 E. Grace Street to the consent agenda. Mr. Green stated that they looked at this previously for the landscape and that now they are looking at it for portico. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Mr. Green stated that he thinks there were some issues with this regarding the design of the portico. Mr. Hill stated that initially they were very concerned and that they took it seriously as a partial demolition and then on closer examination of which application set forth very clearly and that they were working closely with the Department of Historic Resources and Tax Credits. Mr. Hill stated that staff's fears were allayed by the documentation of what original materials that remained and that this sort thing is important because of its role in the preservation of Church Hill and it was designed by Mary Wingfield Scott. Mr. Hill stated that portions of it have been replaced over time and maybe not with the same quality materials that it started out with and staff felt that the documentation that in fact that it is being done in part by tax credit project. Mr. Hill stated that staff was fine with recommending approval. Ms. Chen stated that there is an easement being held on the property by Preservation of Virginia and they supported it.

Mr. Green stated that Mr. Yates and he volunteered to help them find some original materials.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the porch was going to be painted or unpainted or natural wood material.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor withdrew her motion.

Public Comment

Mr. Charlie Field, speaking as a member of the public, came up and spoke against item #9.

Mr. Elmes stated that he had concerns and inquired how the foundation is getting lower and Mr. Hill stated that they went over this at the last meeting and that they are removing some of the courses of the cinderblock and that they are masking a portion of it with siding.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the reason she proposed it for the consent agenda is that the main issue she had with it before was there were no dimensions and she couldn't understand the size of the windows and the relationship of the windows to the floor and ceiling heights. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the applicant provided that.

Mr. Yates stated that regarding item #3, he would like to suggest that the hood over the back door be lowered directly over the door.

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Mr. Bond, to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Bond, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 2 - Elmes and Green

Abstain: 1 - Hendricks

- 1 [CAR No. 2015-100](#) 7 N. 29th Street - Install new window at rear 2nd story

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

- 2 [CAR No. 2015-104](#) 2225 Monument Avenue - Construct missing rear porch with treated lumber and Richmond rail

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the condition that the new porch be painted or opaquely stained.

- 3 [CAR No. 2015-105](#) 613 N. 22nd Street - Replace asphalt siding with wood, replace concrete front porch steps with wood, and add Richmond rail handrails to front steps

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

- 4 [CAR No. 2015-107](#) 211 N. 36th Street - Enclose rear 2nd story porch

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

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

- 9 [CAR No. 2015-099](#) 601-601 1/2 N. 23rd Street - Revise previously-approved plans for the construction of two attached single-family houses

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)
[Site Map](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Application & Plans - July](#)
[Site Map - July](#)
[Staff Report - July](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved as submitted.

REGULAR AGENDA

- 5 [CAR No. 2015-076A](#) 313 N. 24th / 2401 E. Marshall Street - Construct a new mixed-use building and an addition to an existing structure

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

*Mr. Bilder recused himself

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct a mixed-use project which will include multifamily residential units, commercial units, and civic space in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The project was presented at the June 23, 2015 meeting, where it was deferred and the Commission requested additional information. It was presented for conceptual review at the July 28, 2015 meeting where the Commission offered comments regarding the uniformity and placement of the windows, especially in the brick portions of the building; the visibility of the HVAC units on the roofs; and the proposed color/finish for the aluminum windows and doors. Staff also had outstanding questions regarding porch details. Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Andy Condlin, with Roth and Sabastian Quinn, came up and gave a brief description of the changes they made from the Commissions comments and answered questions.

Ms. Cyanne Crump, the Interim Executive Director of Historic Richmond, came up and spoke for the project.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved. Mr. Green made a friendly amendment that they look at the height of the 2nd story cornice and the relative position of the portico to balance the 2nd story a little better. Mr. Hughes added a clarification that the windows don't go all the way to the floor.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Hughes

Recused: 1 - Bilder

- 6 [CAR No. 2015-089A](#) 3 N. Boulevard - Install new upper front porch railing

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report for the applicant's request for the installation of a balustrade on the front balcony of this structure in the Boulevard Old and Historic District. The applicant proposes installing a balustrade that incorporates the historic balusters and modern elements for total height of 42". Staff feels that the proposed new balustrade design, which incorporates the remaining historic balusters in a compatible but contemporary design, is in keeping with the intent of the Guidelines, however, the current sketch does not clearly convey scale and proportions of the intended design. Staff requests that scale drawings be submitted for the proposed design that incorporates paneled pedestals and a substantial top rail, as seen in the historic fabric. Staff recommends approval of the project with those conditions.

Mr. Green stated that they did previously approve a design for this project and Ms. Chen stated yes and that it was a recreation of the original baluster.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Sean Brooks stated that they came up with a second option in order to incorporate the balustrade at a higher level on the front porch which will get it to 42 inches in height and that they are honoring the history as well as getting a railing. Mr. Brooks stated the backing rail is not aesthetically pleasing to them and that they own the property next door at 1 N. Boulevard and the height of that porch is lower and it has the original railing. Mr. Brooks stated that the back of the railings is seven inches taller than 1 N. Boulevard and the front of the porch is one inch taller. Mr. Brooks stated that the idea came from looking at the original balustrade that is higher than what you can see the most from the street and in order to see the lower scoring on the bottom you have to be on the porch to see that. Mr. Brooks stated that visually from the street you should see something that looks similar to what it did and that the pitch on the porch is very steep and sloping to the street so that is how they got the height there.

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

Mr. Green stated that they previously approved a standard design for their current elevation with a backer rod over it which is a fairly standard way to meet code and that the issue is that it is not code height. Mr. Green stated that the issue is getting the height up to code and that the question is how they get to that height.

Mr. Hendricks stated that what is important here is maintaining the proportion of detailed cornice to railing which is missed in the current design. Mr. Hendricks stated that enlarging it is going to be too heavy on that very thin profile of the cornice on the porch. Mr. Hendricks stated that his preference would be the previously approved technique.

Mr. Yates stated that he agrees with Mr. Hendricks that the detailing is not dimensioned and it is way too heavy and that he doesn't see this as a viable solution for second floor railings.

Mr. Elmes stated that the Guidelines represent that missing elements should match photographic evidence and that there are many examples on Monument where they

have allowed an additional foot or so on this 3/4 railing which doesn't have to have the same vertical spacing but has to act as a guard rail. Mr. Elmes stated that the railing itself can be recreated to match 1 S. Boulevard which is a little lighter on their baluster as well and that in looking at photographic evidence he didn't see any ghosting on the building and it would seem more appropriate to rebuild it. Mr. Elmes stated that he knows the applicants want it to look good but they are concerned that it is real heavy on the front façade. Mr. Elmes stated that he has difficulty supporting it because the rendering is saying that it is a 10 inch baluster post and that he is having trouble supporting this based on the Guidelines.

Mr. Brooks stated that it is not double and that the original balusters are almost 20 inches and that there are porches on their block that have 42 inch railings.

Mr. Brooks inquired how one was approved for 42 inches and theirs is not approved at 42 inches. Mr. Brooks stated that they wanted to use a cap rail and that staff said it won't be at code because the cap will be a continuous piece with smaller pickets in it and somebody could still get through it. Mr. Brooks stated that the balusters were in the basement and that he is not sure if they are original.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to defer the application and let the applicant come back and provided the Commission with more information about the design. There was no second and the motion failed.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if this application has the same number as the application they previously approved and Mr. Hill stated yes.

Mr. Elmes stated that this doesn't preclude them from tuning this particular design if this is the direction that the applicant wants to go and that in its form now he can't approve it because of the dimensions that were presented.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Hughes

No: 1 - Bilder

- 7 [CAR No. 2015-092](#) 511-511 1/2 N. 26th Street - Construct a new 4-unit multi-family dwelling

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)
[Site Map](#)
[Staff Report](#)
[Application & Plans - July](#)
[Site Map - July](#)
[Staff Report - July](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a 4-unit multi-family house on two vacant lots in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The project was presented at the July 28th CAR meeting and was deferred so that the applicant could address recommendations and requests made by the Commission. Staff noted that the design and placement/orientation of the ramp will need to be submitted to staff for review, especially if review of the project by Zoning and Building requires changes to the ramp and provided parking. Staff recommends approval of the project with that condition.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Jimmy Freeman came up to answer questions.

Mr. Green stated that there was a letter of objection for this application.

Mr. Aaron Ogburn, speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak against the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the applicant will submit details of the ramp construction to staff for review and administrative approval, noting the revised site plan submitted by the applicant today showing the reversal of the ramp and the handicap parking space in the back and noting the front side door as a drafting error.

Aye: 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

- 8 [CAR No. 2015-094](#) 3607 E. Broad Street - Construct a new single-family house

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - July](#)

[Site Map - July](#)

[Staff Report - July](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a new single-family house on a vacant lot in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. The project was deferred at the July 28th CAR meeting where the Commission asked the applicant to address some concerns that the Commission raised. The applicant has responded to the comments of the Commission and the project is consistent with the Standards for New Construction on pages 45-53 of the Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines. Staff is recommending approval of the project as submitted.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Ms. Amy Tesauro, the owner came up to answer questions.

Ms. Trudy Watkins came up to speak as a citizen on behalf of Mr. Mark Palmer, speaking against the project.

Mr. Green stated that there is a letter of support from DCM Properties.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the HVAC unit will be located at the rear of the house.

Aye: 5 - Bond, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 3 - Elmes, Green and Yates

- 10 [CAR No. 2015-101](#) 2305 Venable Street - Install concrete pad at rear of house

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to install a concrete pad and wood stoop at the rear of a house in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends that a privacy fence be installed on the western property line. Staff also recommends that the rear stoop be painted or opaquely stained. Staff recommends approval of the project with those conditions.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Dave Seibert, owner, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Ann Wortham, speaking a member of the public, came up to ask questions about the project.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the applicant will submit a design of the height transition of the privacy fence from 6' to 4' to staff for review and administrative approval.

Aye: 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

- 11 [CAR No. 2015-102](#) 613 N. 28th Street - Demolish non-historic cinder block quadraplex and conceptual review of new construction

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to demolish a non-historic concrete block quadraplex and construct a new duplex. Staff stated that the building does not possess significant architectural detailing nor is it associated with a building style, prominent architect or historical event sufficient to suggest the demolition would have an adverse effect on the historic character of the historic district. Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the non-historic quadraplex. Staff also presented the staff report for the conceptual review for the construction of two attached, single-family dwellings.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Aaron Ogburn, representing the owner, came up and answered questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Hughes

Abstain: 1 - Bilder

- 12 [CAR No. 2015-103](#) 106 E. Clay Street - Rehabilitation and enclosure of rear 1st and 2nd story porches

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

*Mr. Yates recused himself.

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request to enclose an existing two-story side porch located in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. The applicant is proposing to enclose a two-story porch on the east elevation of the house. The Commission's approval should be conditioned upon the work being performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions. In addition, the applicant should submit any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Services to CAR staff for administrative review and approval. Staff recommends approval of the porch enclosure with that condition.

Ms. Sandy Parks, with Joseph F. Yates Architects, came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved with the conditions that any additional conditions required by the Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Services be submitted to staff for review and that colors be deferred to staff.

Aye: 7 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

Recused: 1 - Yates

- 13 [CAR No. 2015-106](#) 2301 W. Grace Street - Replace existing garage doors with overhead, Carriage House-style garage doors

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace the existing sliding garage doors with overhead Carriage-House-style garage doors at a property located in the West Grace Street Old and Historic District. Staff recommends that a new door that more closely replicates the existing carriage style doors be installed. Staff also noted that the new doors should also fit the opening and not require the removal or alteration of historic fabric. Staff recommends approval of the garage door replacement with those conditions.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Malcolm Agnew, the owner, came up to answer questions.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Green, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the conditions that the door selection be revised to resemble more closely the style of the existing doors, that the door should fit the opening without requiring the removal or alteration of the remaining historic fabric, and that the door selection should be submitted to staff for review and administrative approval.

Aye: 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

- 14 [CAR No. 2015-108](#) 2302 E. Grace Street - Temporary removal of portico for rehabilitation work and replacement of front step treads and risers, as well as portico decking with synthetic lpe

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

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for temporarily removal of a portico for the rehabilitation work and replacement of the front step treads and risers and portico decking with lpe decking at this property in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The applicant proposes to temporarily remove the portico so that the deteriorated brick piers can receive proper footings and be constructed. The Commission's approval should be conditioned upon the work being performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions. In addition, the applicant should submit any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Services to CAR staff for administrative review and approval. Staff recommends approval of the project with those conditions.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Robert Baratta, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Green stated that they received a letter from Preservation of Virginia, from Lewis Mayland, which stated that they are in contact with the applicant and they are working together and that the Board is fine with what they are proposing.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the conditions that all work shall be performed in conformance with an approved Part II Tax Credit application, and that any additional conditions required by the Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service should be submitted to staff for review and administrative approval.

Aye: 8 - Bond, Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

15 [CAR No. 2015-109](#) 2815 E. Clay Street - Install shed in rear yard

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a prefabricated 8'x12' shed at the rear of the property located in the Church Hill Old and Historic District. The shed will be placed approximately 10 to 12 feet from the rear property line and 3 feet from the western property line. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the conditions that colors for the shed be submitted for staff approval.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Matt Leary, the homeowner came up to answer questions.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the colors selected for the shed be submitted to staff for review and administrative approval.

Aye: 7 - Elmes, Green, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

Excused: 1 - Bond

17 [CAR No. 2015-111](#) 2108 1/2 E. Broad Street - Construct new single-family house

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new detached, single-family house on a vacant lot in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The proposed new construction will be located on the north side of E. Broad Street on a narrow lot between two historic houses. Staff recommends approval of the project with these conditions:

- Elevation drawings shall be provided that account for the slope of the site and the impact of the slope on the foundation, finished floor elevation of the first story, and overall height of the building.
- Details and dimensions for the cornice shall be provided.
- Drawings shall be provided for the rear of the building, which is visible from the

alley. These drawings should include details for the rear porch, balcony, and sliding doors.

- Drawings for the side elevations shall be provided that show the window placement and sizes in agreement with the floor plans.
- A site plan shall be provided that shows the front yard setbacks for the adjacent buildings, the location of mechanical equipment, and any proposed or required site improvements such as parking and fencing.
- Color selection shall be provided.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Kyle McLaughlin, with McLaughlin Homes, came up to answer questions. Mr. McLaughlin stated that he bought a piece of the cornice with him and that he has used it before on other projects that were approved. Mr. McLaughlin stated that as far as the site plan goes, he does plan on getting a survey completed and take the average of the two houses next door and hold the setback of the front of the house to the average of the neighbors. Mr. McLaughlin stated that the drawing shows a 4 ft porch and states that he would like to increase that to a 6 ft porch on the front and that he doesn't have a problem doing the Richmond rail on the back and that it was an oversight by the architect. Mr. McLaughlin asked what kind of recommendation that the Commission could give him as far as the random assortment of the windows and inquired if they could defer that to staff.

Mr. Green stated that typically they like to see a similar window in a regular alignment at least at the front half of the side elevation that can be seen from the public right-of-way. Mr. McLaughlin stated that the 1st story porch is not showing handrails and that it was going to be a code requirement to have handrails on that 1st floor. Mr. Green stated that they will typically ask that it be Richmond rail.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the roofing and decking and Mr. McLaughlin stated that the roofing material over the top is going to be standing seam that changes over to TPO and the second story porch is going to be a TPO with wood decking over the top of it. Mr. Elmes stated that they prefer not to see the end cuts.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they will have turned columns and Mr. McLaughlin stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired about the window specs and Mr. McLaughlin stated that they will be Jefferson 300 Series simulated divided lite.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the front portion of the front porch roof is standing seam and the rear portion is a membrane and Mr. McLaughlin stated TPO.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they were both 1 to 12 slope and Mr. McLaughlin stated that they both are rated for a low slope. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the height of the peak and Mr. McLaughlin stated that not at this time and that it should only add about a foot.

Mr. Elmes stated that the specification sheets for the exterior of the home have a lot things that are not right.

Mr. Yates stated that the lower porch shows four columns on the railing and the second floor only shows three and that there are bays on the first floor and two on the second floor. Mr. Yates inquired if they would have any objection to running dual posts in line with the posts on the first floor and Mr. McLaughlin stated that he is fine with that. Mr. Yates stated that the staff reports notes six conditions and that several more have come up during the meeting and inquired if staff still feels comfortable. Mr. Hill stated that it is beginning to be a long list and that if the Commission is comfortable and they detail at length the things that are required. Mr. Yates stated that he would defer the application until some of the issues are resolved.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were tongue and groove on the surface of the porch and Mr. McLaughlin stated that it would be wood decking.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the cornice and bracket should align with the edge of the window frames. Mr. McLaughlin stated that he has seen some that don't align with the windows and that if the Commission wants them aligned then he will align them.

Mr. John Isenberg, speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak against the project.

Mr. Yates stated that they received a letter of comments from the property owner to the east.

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

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that besides from the issues that have come up and the conflicts that have been noted between the drawings and other parts of the application and that the one of her main concerns is the height and the fact that is a steep sloping hill. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they don't have clear contextual dimensions for how the height of the house compares to the houses on the left and the right when you take the slope into account. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor also stated that the dimension line for the main floor is higher than where the floor is shown in the elevation and that she is generally concerned about all of the dimensions on the elevations and would like to see clear dimensions on both sides of the house to confirm the overall height from grade.

Mr. Bilder stated that they need an engineer survey showing the width of the house.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that because there is a public alley behind the property they need a site plan showing the parking and whether there is a fence and where the HVAC would be.

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred based on the questions that the Commission brought up to clarify building heights, details on the front façade relative to the doors and clean up the specification sheet.

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

Excused: 2 - Bond and Green

18 [CAR No. 2015-112](#) 2805 E. Clay Street - Replace siding, windows, and front door

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chin presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace siding, windows, and the front door on a house in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The application is the result of enforcement activity. Staff recommends partial approval of the application with these conditions:

- That the five sashes on the front and the two sashes on the west elevation (first bay) be replaced with 6/6 simulated divided light sash.
- That smooth Hardiplank be installed on the façade.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if staff would be comfortable with keeping the existing sashes but applying the muntins and Mr. Hill stated that staff usually doesn't go that far because that is not something that is in the Guidelines nor something that the Commission would approve.

Mr. Yates opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. James Coffey stated that the door was not replaced and that the reason that they wanted another door is that they had a break in and the front door was kicked in. Mr. Coffey stated that he didn't know that he had to come before the Commission and that he apologizes and that every decision he made came from walking through the neighborhood and saw the benefits and beautiful things that were going on to keep their neighborhood fresh. Mr. Coffey stated that he has photos within a two block radius of his neighborhood which is why he chose textured Hardiplank over smooth and why he chose the single window over the muntin window.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the applicant wants to change the front door and Mr. Coffey stated yes and that he found a very similar door. Mr. Elmes stated that some of the Hardiplank in the neighborhood was pre-district so it had wood grain and that the Guidelines are pretty specific on using the smooth Hardiplank verses the faux wood. Mr. Elmes inquired if the windows are on the site and Mr. Coffey stated that they are not.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the applicant talked to a window manufacturer to see if they offer applied muntins and Mr. Coffey stated that he will find out.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that could be a way to alleviate that issue.

Mr. Hendricks inquired what the existing windows were and Mr. Coffey stated that 6-over-6 but that they were not original to the house and they were replaced in the 50's or 60's. Mr. Hendricks inquired if they still had the wheel and pulley weights in them and Mr. Coffey stated that some of the windows had them but that none of them worked and some of the windows did not have them.

Mr. Yates stated that Mr. Coffey is willing to work with the Commission and that it was an obvious mistake on his part and that they should defer this until next month because he has a concern about the door.

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

Mr. Hughes made a motion to defer the application.

Mr. Hill inquired if there was a reason or questions that they need answered.

Mr. Elmes stated that they want to give Mr. Coffey time to find out if there is an applied mullion situation where they could have a 6-over-6 window at least to the façade windows. Mr. Elmes stated that the other question is to see if he can talk to his contracting company to find out if there is a way to amend at least the front façade of the property to have smooth Hardiplank on it.

Mr. Yates made an amendment to see if front door could be repaired.

A motion was made by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Mr. Elmes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to give the applicant an opportunity to see if they can do applied mullions, and to investigate the proper Hardiplank siding and defer the front door replacement to staff with photos of the existing damaged door.

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

Excused: 2 - Bond and Green

- 19 [CAR No. 2015-113](#) 2325 Venable Street - Construct a new mixed-use building

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)
[Site Map](#)

This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was withdrawn at the applicant's request.

- 20 [CAR No. 2015-114](#) 823 Mosby Street - Resize windows and install doors

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

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to resize windows and install doors to a building in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicant was served a Notice of Violation in October 2014 for work done without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The owner proposes to largely return the windows and doors to their condition prior to the Notice of Violation with the understanding that much of this work does not meet the Standards for Rehabilitation, pages 54-68. Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted with the condition that the applicant return to the Commission with complete plans for the exterior of the building.

Mr. Yates opened the floor for applicant and public comment.

Mr. Mohamed Sultany, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Nancy Lambert, citizen and resident of Union Hill, came up to speak against the project.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved so that the stop work order can be lifted so that a new application can come forward understanding that no exterior changes go forward without CAR approval.

Aye: 5 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Hughes

No: 1 - Bilder

Excused: 2 - Bond and Green

- 21 [CAR No. 2015-115](#) 314 N. 21st Street - Reconstruct front porch

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to reconstruct the front porch on a dwelling located in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District. The applicant proposed to reconstruct the porch to its original dimensions with a shed roof clad with metal. The applicant submitted paint colors for the house and the porch. The hipped configuration of the roof, the denticulated box cornice, elongated brackets and turned posts are major character-defining features of the porch and should be matched as closely as possible. If any original materials were salvaged from the porch they should be reused or replicated. Staff recommends approval of the project as submitted with these conditions that a hipped roof, as seen in photographs, clad with either flat lock metal or dark membrane be installed, a box cornice with dentils, as seen in photographs, be installed, that a new, repaired or replicated elongated brackets, similar to those seen in photographs, be installed, and that turned columns similar to those seen in the photographs of the same width as the brackets.

Mr. Yates opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Nathan Smith came up to answer questions.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the conditions that the porch plans are revised to replicate the historic bell-cast roof form, noting that the porch roof material could be TPO membrane or modified bitumen, allowing for the use of square chamfered posts, and that selection of the corbel style should be submitted to staff for review and administrative approval.

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

Excused: 2 - Bond and Green

- 16 [CAR No. 2015-110](#) Final Location, Character and Extent Review of renovations to Abner Clay Park at 216 West Clay Street

Attachments: [CAR Report to CPC](#)

[Staff Report to CAR](#)

[Application & Plans](#)

[Location Map](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to substantially rework the grounds of Abner Clay Park and the Adult Career Development Center. Substantial improvements will take place at the northern and southern corners of the park and along the east side. The large parking lots on both sides of the center will be landscaped and a large open space on Adam Street converted into fenced park areas for large and small dogs. As the project is proposed for publicly owned land, the applicant is not seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness under the City's Zoning Code but rather a recommendation on public improvements to the Planning Commission. Staff will prepare a report with the Commission of Architectural Review's recommendation and comments. Staff is recommending that the Commission forward a

recommendation of approval for the proposed improvements to Abner Clay Park.

Therefore, the staff of the Commission of Architectural Review recommends that the Planning Commission grant final approval, with the following condition: That there is strict adherence to the specified sizes for the trees included in the planting plan

Mr. Yates opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Haywood Harrison with the Department of Park and Recreation Community facilities came up to answer questions.

Mr. Scott Wiley, Landscape Architect with the Timmons Group, came up and gave a brief presentation.

Mr. Burt Baskerfield, Architect and Consultant for the Timmons Group, came up to answer questions.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Hendricks, that the Commission of Architectural Review recommends that the proposal be forwarded to the Planning Commission with a recommendation for final approval, emphasizing the Commission of Architectural Review's full support for the plan as well as for strict adherence to the specified sizes for the trees included in the planting plan.

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

Excused: 2 - Bond and Green

Adjournment

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.