

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

MINUTES

May 26, 2015

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, May 26, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Mr. Bryan Green, Chair
 Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair
 Mr. Joshua Bilder
 Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Ms. Jennifer Wimmer
 Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Sanford Bond

Members absent: None

Staff Present: Ms. Marianne G. Pitts, CAR Secretary
 Mr. James Hill, DPDR
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary
 Ms. Kimberly Chen, PDPR

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes:

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the April 28th minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-1 (Bond abstained).

National Register Nomination

Ms. Pitts read the National Register Nomination for the Jerman Residence and gave a brief description of the history of the Residence. Ms. Pitts stated that staff recommends

that the Commission support the listing for this building on the State and Federal level Historic Registers, under the National Register Criteria C.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion that the Commission support the nomination under Criteria C. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passes 9-0-0.

Secretary Report

Ms. Pitts stated that the property owners of 407 N. Allen Avenue stated that in June they will have somebody to perform what they are planning on doing with the brick because it will be warm enough. Ms. Pitts stated that today Council should be continuing the paper because both the property owners and the Commission are okay with the continuation of the appeal. She stated that the only issue is that they might have to continue the appeal one more time based on the fact that Council does not meet in August and the last meeting for Land Use Committee is probably going to be June 16th. Ms. Pitts stated that if they haven't had the opportunity to perform the test on the brick by that time they might have to extend the appeal one additional time. Mr. Green stated that as long as the applicants are working with staff on a conclusion the Commission will be happy to give them some time.

Ms. Pitts stated that they need to decide who they are going to send the letter to for the BRT. Ms. Wimmer stated that they could send it to City Council, the Mayor and GRTC.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they sending it to the UDC, and Mr. Green stated yes and stated that certain elements of it will come back to UDC. Mr. Green stated that he has been contacted by GRTC to discuss some of the issues and will be meeting with them on June 15th.

Administrative Approvals

Mr. Palmquist distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 46 approvals for the period from March 24, 2015 through April 27, 2015.

Partial List of Administrative Approvals (Building Permits and Certificate Applications) Issued by Commission Staff

Address			CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
2501	PARK	AV		4/28/2015	E15042402	4/29/2015	A15-133	Service upgrade 200-400 amps	Service upgrade consists of replacing panels and meter on the interior of the structure, and relocation of the service from the southwest corner of the building to the southeast corner (along the alley side) as per Dominion Power	WP
4211	HERMITAGE	RO		3/13/2015	B15031104	4/29/2015	A15-134	The school will be bringing in 2 24x60 modular classroom buildings that will be used for a temporary basis	Proposal for two temporary buildings is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval on 4/28/2015	WP
20	W LEIGH	ST		8/16/2013	B13080512	10/9/2013	A15-135	External changes to garage	Rev 4/29/15. CAR chair confirms that changes to eaves are within performance of original CAR approval	WP
1603	MONUMENT	AV		4/29/2015	M15042806	4/29/2015	A15-136	Replacement of cooling tower like for like	In-kind replacement of existing cooling tower	WP
2710	MONUMENT	AV		4/30/2015	B15043005	4/30/2015	A15-137	Rear yard patio. No foundation	Patio construction will not be visible from the public right-of-way. No CAR review required	JCH
405	N ALLEN	AV	4/26/2015			4/30/2015	A15-138	Painting all exterior woodwork excluding the front door on an existing brick home cream and replacing the existing storm windows with new 1/1 storm windows painted cream to match the window trim		MP
807	N 23RD	ST		4/29/2015	M15042901	5/1/2015	A15-139	Install two heat pumps with duct work	Heat pumps to be located at rear sides of property and screened from view by small wooden fence-style enclosure	WP

Address				CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
313	N	23RD	ST	5/1/2015			5/1/2015	A15-140	Maintenance and repair with in-kind materials of elements of existing front porch to include replacement of rotten crown molding; replacement of rotten 1" by 6" fascia and soffit; replacement of porch ceiling with wood 1" by 8" beaded tongue and groove; replacement of concrete patio and stairs with the handrails to be reinstalled; and painting of wooden elements white exterior grade latex paint in satin sheen to match existing		MP
718	N	27TH	ST		5/1/2015	P15050101	5/1/2015	A15-141	Install new water, waste and vent piping and new fixtures	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
15	S	13TH	ST		4/10/2015	B15040909	5/1/2015	A15-142	Tenant improvements for 3rd and 4th floor tenant (finishes, case-work, office partitions), in addition to a rooftop penthouse/conference center (approx. 16' x 40')	Permit has been revised to include only work not visible from the public right-of-way. Penthouse addition will be reviewed as a separate permit and is not covered with this permit	JCH
3404	E	BROAD	ST		5/4/2015	P15042701	5/4/2015	A15-143	New single family dwelling, residential plumbing	Approved as part of construction reviewed and approved by Commission of Architectural Review on 1/27/2015	JCH
3404	E	BROAD	ST		5/4/2015	N15042701	5/4/2015	A15-144	New single family dwelling, residential gas	Approved as part of construction reviewed and approved by Commission of Architectural Review on 1/27/2015	JCH
3008	E	BROAD	ST		5/4/2015	M15050101	5/4/2015	A15-145	Install 2 complete multi-zone units, one condenser for each floor (upstairs condenser on roof, 4 indoor high-wall units on second floor and 3 high-wall units on the first floor	One outdoor unit to be located on roof, not visible from public ROW. Other unit to be located in rear behind privacy fence and not visible from public ROW. Lines on each side of the middle of the house within a conduit painted to match the house color	WP

Address				CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
605	N	21ST	ST	5/5/2015			5/1/515	A15-146	Painting the front door SW 6990 Caviar, painting the porch columns railing and decking white, and installing a 6-foot, dog-eared privacy fence around the rear of the property		MP
3309	W	GRACE	ST		5/6/2015	E15040917	5/6/2015	A15-147	Wire kitchen, bathroom, and bedroom to plan wire for new HVAC units	Interior work and wiring for future HVAC units which will need to be reviewed on separate mechanical permit	WP
2202	E	MARSHALL	ST	5/7/2015			5/7/2015	A15-148	Painting of the structure the following colors: Roycroft Copper Red for the siding and Eastlake Gold for the trim and window sashes		MP
721	N	24TH	ST		5/7/2015	P15050709	5/7/2015	A15-149	Install new plumbing to house	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2512		MONUMENT	AV		5/7/2015	M15050602	5/7/2015	A15-150	Replace 70,000 BTU gas furnace with 3 ton A/C	Like-for-like replacement of existing furnace and A/C unit in same location as existing	WP
413	N	27TH	ST		5/7/2015	B15042903	5/7/2015	A15-151	Project Homes project: misc home repairs	Replacement of front porch railing and rear door is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval on 2/24/15	WP
2322	W	GRACE	ST		5/7/2015	B15050709	5/7/2015	A15-152	Exploratory demo: remove wall/floor to determine structural stability	Approved for interior work only. Any change in scope that involves exterior changes visible from the public right-of-way will require consultation with Commission of Architectural Review staff	JCH
2322	W	GRACE	ST		5/7/2015	B15050710	5/8/2015	A15-153	Renovate house per attached plans	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2315		MONUMENT	AV		5/7/2015	B15050410	5/8/2015	A15-154	Interior renovation - main bulk of work on the second floor - a few proposed new openings on the first floor	Interior work and modification to openings on interior facing sections of structure which are not visible from the public right-of-way. No other exterior work authorized under this permit	WP

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
2102 E CLAY ST	5/8/2015			5/11/2015	A15-155	Maintenance and repair to existing windows to include replacing broken glass, re-glazing windows, re-painting the trim Classic White Buff, and painting the window sashes Classic White Buff to match the trim		MP
2102 E CLAY ST	5/11/2015			5/11/2015	A15-156	Replacement of front storm door with Andersen 4000 Series storm door		MP
515 ST JAMES ST		5/6/2015	M15050604	5/11/2015	A15-157	Install a 2 ton heat pump system with new ductwork	Heat pump to be located in center of building's roof and will not be visible from the public right-of-way	WP
2811 E MARSHALL ST		5/12/2015	B15051101	5/12/2015	A15-158	Remove the wall of garage/remove kitchen cabinets/replace a current bathroom: floor and vanity/replace the floor on back room on main floor/paint in basement, doors/fix exterior steps	Interior work only. Removal of garage wall is on the interior of the garage. Paint will be same color as existing. Repair is in-kind materials. No other exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
7 N 29TH ST		5/12/2015	B15050813	5/12/2015	A15-159	Interior renovations and addition of back porch/deck	Demolition of existing deck and construction of new deck is consistent with Commission of Architectural Review approval from 4/28/15. New 1st floor rear window not visible from public right-of-way because of existing privacy fence	WP
3317 MONUMENT AV		5/13/2015	E15051301	5/13/2015	A15-160	Wire new addition. Renovate 2nd floor bathroom, upgrade service to 400 amps	Interior work for previously approved addition from the 10/28/14 and 4/28/15 Commission of Architectural Review meetings	WP
613 N 2ND ST		5/12/2015	B15051209	5/13/2015	A15-161	Light demo and repair/replace of failing T.P.O. roof with in kind roof/light demo and repair/replace of rotting wood siding with in-kind wood siding	Work consists of in-kind repair and replacement of TPO roof and rotten wood siding. Applicant will come before the Commission of Architectural Review for more extensive repair and renovation plans	WP
818 N 25TH ST		5/13/2015	B15051318	5/13/2015	A15-162	Interior stabilization of roof/walls, demo interior plaster, no exterior work to home	Interior stabilization and demo only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
807 N 23RD ST		5/13/2015	E15051319	5/13/2015	A15-163	Wire to code	Service meter must be located on side of house, not on the front elevation	JCH
2813 M ST		5/18/2015	K15051502	5/18/2015	A15-164	Install new NFPA 13R sprinkler system. Start 1' above finish floor	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
617 N 23RD ST		5/18/2015	B15051503	5/18/2015	A15-165	Whole house renovation, no exterior changes, structural amendment coming	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit including the replacement of windows	WP
617 1 N 23RD ST		5/18/2015	B15051504	5/18/2015	A15-166	Whole house renovation, no exterior changes, structural amendment coming	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit including the replacement of windows	WP
2309 W GRACE ST		5/18/2015	P15051807	5/18/2015	A15-167	Replace sewer line approx 90' of 4" prespiped 2' to 14' deep from house sewer to connection at property line	Interior and underground utility work only. No exterior work/changes authorized under this permit	WP
2813 M ST		5/18/2015	P15051306	5/18/2015	A15-168	Install all new plumbing for a new quadraplex	Interior plumbing work for previously approved quadraplex	WP
2707 E BROAD ST		5/19/2015	M15051305	5/20/2015	A15-169	Install 3 Mitsubishi mini split systems	Exterior units located in rear of property and not visible from public right-of-way due to fence and shed	WP
2516 MONUMENT AV		5/20/2015	M15051903	5/20/2015	A15-170	Reline furnace flue with a stainless steel chimney liner	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
718 N 27TH ST		5/21/2015	M15052115	5/21/2015	A15-171	Install HVAC	Exterior units will be screened and located within a privacy fence	JCH
2822 W GRACE ST		5/21/2015	N15052001	5/22/2015	A15-172	Run glass line for apartments (6)	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
119 E LEIGH ST		5/22/2015	K15052101	5/22/2015	A15-173	Install new wet type sprinkler system	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2813 M ST		5/22/2015	M15052112	5/22/2015	A15-174	Install 2.2-ton heat pumps and ductwork, installing 2 1/2 ton heat pumps and ductwork	Exterior units located in side yard towards rear of building and to be screened from view from the public right-of-way	WP

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
805 1 N 23RD ST		5/22/2015	M15052113	5/22/2015	A15-175	Install two 1.5 ton heat pumps with ductwork	Outdoor unit to be located in the side yard between the two new single-family houses and to be screened from view from N. 23rd St	WP
805 N 23RD ST		5/22/2015	M15052109	5/22/2015	A15-176	Install two 1.5 ton heat pumps with ductwork	Outdoor unit to be located in the side yard between the two new single-family houses and to be screened from view from N. 23rd St	WP
2025 VENABLE ST		5/22/2015	P15051510	5/22/2015	A15-177	Redo plumbing for 3 apartments and a storefront	Interior work only. No exterior work authorized under this permit	WP
2615 E CLAY ST		5/22/2015		5/22/2015	A15-178	Installation of Richmond rail handrails down the front steps to match the existing porch railing	The rail shall be painted in the colors approved as a part of Administrative Approval No. A15-087 which are One Coat White for the rail pickets and Argos for the handrail	MP

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the modular classroom buildings came before the Commission, and Mr. Palmquist stated that is the permit for that.

Mr. Green inquired about how many Administrative approvals are done, and Mr. Palmquist stated that they did about 650 last year so maybe it is about 45 or 50 a month.

Enforcement Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that they are actively working with applicants who have been before the Commission in last few months for items that were deferred and stated that they are giving many of them until this Friday to resubmit something that the Commission asked for. Mr. Palmquist stated that they are waiting to see what staff gets by that date, and if staff does not get anything by that date then they will proceed with the next enforcement steps. They have several new complaints and violations for which staff will be issuing Notices of Violations. Mr. Palmquist stated that staff has been working to revamp the Notice of Violation letter to make it more simplified and easy to understand without extra language that does not apply to the CAR process. Mr. Palmquist stated that they have been working with the City's legal counsel and the Zoning Division to make necessary changes and stated that hopefully they will have a new letter that they can start using it.

Mr. Green inquired if it has been effective with the Commission deferring applications to give the applicants more time. Mr. Palmquist stated that he believes it is very effective though many of the violations have not come to a conclusion yet so it is hard to say. Mr. Palmquist stated that overall it is a good strategy but sometimes applicants do not show much initiative to come back to the Commission. Mr. Green stated that this is something that they could discuss more at the quarterly meeting.

The Commission briefly discussed the other Commissions meetings.

The Commission briefly discussed the next quarterly meeting and where it would be located.

Committee Report from UDC

Mr. Green stated that the Urban Design Committee reviewed the following project's this month: a neighborhood sign encroachment at the intersection of Iron Bridge Road and Kenmare Loop, a final location and character review of two new buildings at 1638, 1650 and 1700 Commerce Road, and a final character, location and extent review of two more buildings at 3502 Hopkins Road. Mr. Green stated that the final item was the final character, location and extent review of the renovations at Kanawha Plaza. Mr. Green stated that the project was complicated and that there was a sense that the project had issues. Mr. Green stated that the applicant was requested to try and meet with a sub-

committee of the Urban Design Committee before their presentation to the Planning Commission and try to adopt some of the changes that were recommended by the Urban Design Committee. Mr. Green stated that the Planning Commission approved the project as submitted.

Mr. James Hill stated that with the Houghton case the violation has not been remediated and stated that the City Attorney has prepared the paperwork for a show cause to bring the applicant back to court to explain why he has not complied with courts request that he remediated and that will be on June 26th.

Mr. Hughes stated that he likes that they are adding the minutes from the prior meetings when an application has been before the Commission previously so the Commission will have some prior context and stated that he appreciates that.

*recess 3:52 pm

*resumes 4:00 pm

Consent Agenda

Mr. Hughes stated that on item #2 for 1828 Monument he is not opposed to staff's findings and inquired why the balcony railings are being replaced and not being kept in the first place, and Ms. Pitts stated that is it to provide a safer access for people on the second story balcony.

Mr. Bilder stated that on item #3 for 13 S. 13th Street they are constructing a rooftop penthouse, and it does not seem like the proportions are accurate. Mr. Green stated that the applicants have done mock-ups and stated that the standard rules for DHR is that the public right-of-way is defined as the sidewalk opposite. Mr. Bilder inquired if they usually approve projects like this without presenting them to the Commission, and Mr. Green stated that they have approved small penthouses and additions before. Additionally, Mr. Green stated that the project had received its Part 2 approval for tax credits.

Mr. Bilder made a motion to move item #3 for 13 S. 13th Street from the consent agenda to the regular agenda. There was no second and the motion failed.

Ms. Pitts stated that item #5 on the consent agenda for the proposed awning the applicant originally presented two different materials and staff conditioned the application for approval for one of the materials. Ms. Pitts stated that after the submittal the applicant stated that she would prefer the laminated material for which staff did not recommend approval and stated that it hasn't changed staff's recommendation. Ms. Pitts showed the Commission members a sample of the material.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item #13 for 3 N. Boulevard from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Mr. Green stated that he is concerned with the extrusion of the balustrade to the code level height and stated that he would rather see the original balustrade in place with a simple backer rail to bring it up to code. Mr. Yates stated that it is his concern also.

After further discussion the motion failed 3-6-0(Wimmer, Green, Bilder, Elmes, Yates, and Aarons-Sydnor against).

Mr. Hughes made a motion to move item #10 for 323 N. 27th Street from the regular

agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the alley behind the house was public property.

After further discussion the motion passed 6-2-0(Elmes and Green opposed).

Mr. Hughes made a motion to move item #14 for 414 N. 28th Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor.

Ms. Wimmer stated that there was a condition in the staff report that they not use the vinyl.

After further discussion the motion passed 6-2-0(Green and Wimmer opposed).

Mr. Hughes made a motion to move item #17 for 201 W. Broad Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Bilder and failed 3-5-1 (Green, Elmes, Yates, Hendricks and Wimmer opposed and Bond recused).

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the consent agenda with staff recommendations and as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 8-1-0(Bilder opposed).

Application No. 15-068 (J. Haw)

13 S. 13th Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-046 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 8-1-0(Bilder opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant request for approval to construct a new rooftop penthouse and alter existing windows and doors, and

 WHEREAS, that any changes required by the National Park Services or the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for tax credit purposes be deferred to Commission staff for final review, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Wimmer, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor, Yates, Elmes and Bond

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-070 (H. Kellman)

2031 Monument Avenue

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-070 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 8-1-0 (Bilder opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install new windows, replace existing windows, and paint elements, and

 WHEREAS, that all the windows be true divided lite or simulated divided lite, and

 WHEREAS, any changes required by the National Park Services or Virginia Department of Historic Resources for tax credit purposes be deferred to Commission staff for final review, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Wimmer, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, and Aarons-Sydnor, Yates, Elmes and Bond

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-071 (B. Lewis)

2804 E. Leigh Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-071 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 8-1-0 (Bilder opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install awnings over side deck, and

 WHEREAS, the awning mounted hardware be installed directly into the mortar joints to avoid damage to the historic masonry, and

 WHEREAS, the durable woven fabric in the Western Red or Red Brick color be used, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Wimmer, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, and Aarons-Sydnor, Yates, Elmes and Bond

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-061 (J. Horn & S. Marshall)

323 N. 27th Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-061 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 8-1-0 (Bilder opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes modifications to the front and rear porches, and

 WHEREAS, that the screening material that is as transparent as possible be used so that the porch conveys the appearance of a traditional open porch, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Wimmer, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, and Aarons-Sydnor, Yates, Elmes and Bond

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-065 (J. & T. Moran)

414 N. 28th Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Hughes introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-065 for the reasons stated in the staff report as being consistent with the guidelines in the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*. Mr. Bond seconded the motion, and it passed 8-1-0 (Bilder opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace three windows at rear of the house, and

 WHEREAS, that true divided lite or simulated divided lite wood or aluminum clad wood windows be installed rather than vinyl windows, and

 WHEREAS, as it is not visible public right-of-way, the southernmost window was not under the purview of the Commission, and

 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Wimmer, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, and Aarons-Sydnor, Yates, Elmes and Bond

 Negative: Bilder

 Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 15-056 (E. Barnes)

2030 Monument Avenue

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request for approval for painting work performed at this property in the Monument Old and Historic District. This application is the result of enforcement activity. Staff does not recommend approval of the project. Staff recommends that the property owner works with a qualified, historic preservation professional who is knowledgeable in the removal of paint from historic masonry to remove the paint and restore the condition of the façade and front porch.

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

Mr. Edward Barnes stated that he has owned this building since 1974 and that he has never painted the brick and doesn't know how this occurred. Mr. Barnes stated that this didn't come to his notice until he received the Notice of Violation. Mr. Barnes stated that the real estate company that handles this building for him didn't know anything about it either. Mr. Barnes stated that from the photograph in 2012 the lintel above the first floor window was a tan color and now the photograph shows that it is red and he has no idea how it happened. Mr. Barnes stated that he wants the Commission to understand that they didn't do this and know that they will have to remove the paint from the lintel above the first floor window. Mr. Barnes stated that he doesn't understand or see in the picture where front porch is involved.

Mr. Palmquist stated that it is on the masonry on the porch. Mr. Barnes asked that this be deferred so that he can get some estimates.

Mr. Green inquired if the applicant wants it to be deferred so that they can remove the paint from the lintels and the brick and Mr. Barnes stated yes.

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

Mr. Bilder made a motion to defer the project so that he owner can get some estimates for the paint removal.

Mr. Bonds made a friendly amendment that they defer the project so the applicant can get an estimate to remove all of the paint from the masonry.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 9-0-0.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it shouldn't be deferred and that it is in clear violation and should be denied.

Mr. Elmes stated that they can defer it so the applicant can remediate the issue and they won't have to come back to the Commission but can work with staff.

Application No. 15-060 (Q. King)

916 N. 25th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval for work performed at the property which includes replacing non-historic metal porch railings and stair railings with vinyl railings and handrails, replacing non-historic metal porch columns with wood columns, and replacing several historic windows with vinyl windows. Staff does not recommend approval of the project. Staff recommends that the applicant return to the Commission with a new porch railing and handrail design that is in keeping with the *Guidelines*, as well as a more appropriate type of window replacement.

Mr. Yates stated that the photos of the front door show it was replaced and Mr. Palmquist stated that the door was replaced and technically is in violation as well.

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

Mr. Quinton King the owner came up to speak and answered questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the project as presented with the elements that are in place currently with the vinyl handrail and replacements windows notwithstanding the replacement door. Mr. Elmes stated that he feels that the elements that are being replaced aren't replacing elements that were contributing to the historic fabric of the structure. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-3-0 (Yates, Wimmer and Aarons-Sydnor opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace front porch and stair railing and replace windows, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Hendricks, Hughes, And Green
 Negative: Aarons-Sydnor, Wimmer and Yates
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-062 (A. Beach)

608 N. 27th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant is requesting approval to construct a single-family house on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that the cornice brackets be located to frame each window, not spaced equidistantly across the cornice as is currently proposed. Staff recommends that the applicant come back to Commission staff for review and approval of paint colors.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired what the front door glass is and Mr. Palmquist stated that it is a half lite door.

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

Mr. Andy Beach stated that it is a similar floor plan that they did last year at 610 N. 23rd Street which they got approval for by the Commission. Mr. Beach stated that they have implemented some of the CAR recommendations and came back with this plan.

Mr. Elmes stated that in the front elevation front porch heights being plus or minus 4ft and stated that the house to the south only has 3 front stairs and the front porch rise on the stairs is less than 3ft. Mr. Elmes stated that the house to the north has 3 stairs and one off the curb and is still less than 4ft but the applicant show that the porches are completely aligned. Mr. Elmes inquired what they were shooting for and Mr. Beach stated that they are shooting for them to be aligned and that it is based on the grade of the lot they should be able to make the drainage work and they will be the same height as the house on the left. Mr. Elmes stated that on the elevation drawing the porch on the house to the left is a foot taller than reality and stated that they are trying to approve something that is correct in scale. Mr. Elmes stated that they are showing a least five stairs when there are only three and the same is true for the one on the north side and inquired if they are pulling their porch down to align with the two and Mr. Beach stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if that would change the height or elevation on the front façade of the fenestration and Mr. Beach stated that they are going to align at the top and that the person has drawn the three porches higher than they are. Mr. Elmes inquired about the porch columns and Mr. Beach stated that they are going to be a 5 ¼" base with a turned column to match the house on the left. Mr. Elmes asked if they are having a 4x4 wooden column and Mr. Beach stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if the front porch will have EPDM or TPO on it and Mr. Beach stated EPMD black. Mr. Elmes inquired that it will not be curved but with a shallow hip and a gutter and Mr. Beach stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if the porch was inboard of the structure and Mr. Beach stated that the roof overhangs with the side of the house.

Mr. Hendricks stated that on the rear elevation of the drawing on the left side there appears to be a jog in the building and stated that it looks like there is a double line and it has shifted to the right. Mr. Hendricks inquired if there was something in the plan showing that and Mr. Beach stated no, that it is straight.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they need to have drawings that accurately reflect the changes that the applicant stated that shows the clarifications.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to defer the application so the applicant can come back with clarifications of the drawings.

Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that there be clarification to have justification for the distance between the top of the windows and cornice on the front elevation.

For clarification Mr. Yates stated that the distance between the top of the windows and the bottom of the cornice is extremely exaggerated on this new house.

After further discussion the motion to defer was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 9-0-0.

Application No. 15-063 (D. Kleyman)

2100-2102 M. Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to construct a single-family house on two vacant lots in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending that approval of the project be conditioned on the following: that the cornice brackets be aligned to frame each window, not spaced equidistantly as currently proposed, that the 4-pane 4-lite front door be substituted with a paneled door with no lites, that the transom windows on the sides of the structure be omitted from the final design and that the applicant seek administrative review and approval of the proposed privacy fence and opaque stain color.

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

Mr. Daniel Kleyman stated that he has an updated alley side and front elevation that shows the new cornice design. Mr. Kleyman stated that he got rid of the transom window that is facing the alley and stated that if the lack of the window from the second story is a concern then he has a proposal for two windows on the second floor. Mr. Kleyman stated that he would like to keep the other transoms because that is the only way to let natural light into the bathrooms and that the other side is not facing the alley and is not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Kleyman distributed some new plans and stated that now the brackets are framing the windows or the cornice line.

Mr. Green inquired where they are basing the front door design by having a 5th bay into a very compact 4 bay building to get a center door and asked how that fits in the district. Mr. Kleyman stated that he doesn't have a supporting structure and that it is in line with some of the other projects that they have gotten approved. Mr. Green stated that traditionally one of the four windows will be a door. Mr. Kleyman stated that with the floor plan the door has to be centered and that he made it symmetrical. Mr. Green inquired if that was the plan and Mr. Kleyman stated yes and stated that it is a very tricky lot.

Mr. Yates stated that the spacing between the second floor window and the cornice seems to be exaggerated and that he would recommend bringing it down to the cornice level to minimize the distance. Mr. Kleyman stated that the cornice line is 2ft which is what they usually install and inquired if they needed a taller cornice line and Mr. Yates stated that he is suggesting that the distance between the top of the windows and the bottom of the cornice is unusually high. Mr. Kleyman stated that given the design of the building it is correct because it's a pitched roof that goes front to back and that given the design of the roof trusses they are going to be taller in the front than they are in the back. Mr. Yates stated that there are ways to mitigate that.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor asked about the head height of the windows on the second floor and Mr. Kleyman stated that they are 66 inch windows.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he is also troubled by the proportions on the front elevation with the 3 bays porch and the 4 bays on the upper floor and 5 bays on the lower floor.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she agrees with the staff report in terms of the citing, height, width and proportion and massing and stated that that it is the form that is inconsistent with the style and that this is not the correct style for this form.

Mr. Hughes inquired if the porch needed to be shifted so that when you walk up you'll be at the door and Mr. Green stated yes and that traditionally you will see a 3 bay design. Mr. Hughes stated that it makes sense to have the door in the middle unless you have two house joined together.

Mr. Elmes stated that he doesn't disagree that it is unusual but that there is a house on 29th and Clay that has the same facade configuration but that the door itself has side lites and the windows are pushed outwards so it doesn't give that cramped feeling and that it wouldn't preclude the interior layout.

Ms. Wimmer read the Guidelines on form on page 44 item number 1.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to deny the application based on the Guidelines on page 44 for form for new construction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Hughes stated that he would rather have the application deferred.

After further discussion the motion failed 4-5-0(Green, Elmes, Bilder, Hughes and Bond opposed).

Mr. Hughes made a motion to defer the application so the applicant can come back with clarification by addressing the form of the building and what was proposed during the meeting.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor added a friendly amendment to add a full dimension front elevation and 2nd floor plans.

Mr. Kleyman inquired if the preference was for the 3 bay and Mr. Elmes stated that it is for the form.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 7-2-0(Wimmer and Hendricks opposed).

Application No. 15-067 (P. & M. Anderson)

2115 M. Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for permission to install a two-story addition to the rear of the structure in the Union Hill Old and Historic District and reconstruct the existing chimney. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the condition that the proposed siding be smooth and unbeaded and that the proposed French doors be true divided or simulated divided light.

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

Ms. Paige Anderson came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application as outlined in the staff report with the qualifications that the siding be smooth Hardi Plank, where the siding meets the brick that it be indented slightly so that it is not flushed, that the double hung windows on the one elevation align with the first and second floor, and that the bathroom window be adjusted so that it is closer to the size of the first floor window. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct as addition at rear of home and rehab existing chimney, and
 WHEREAS, that the proposed siding be smooth and unbeaded, and
 WHEREAS, the siding be inset where it meets the existing brick, and
 WHEREAS, the transom on the west elevation be reduced to the size of the proposed first floor window, and
 WHEREAS, the windows on the first and second floor of the east elevation line up vertically, and
 WHEREAS, the proposed French door be true divided or simulated divided lite, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Green, Hughes, Hendricks, Wimmer, Yates and Aarons-Sydnor
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Conceptual Review

Application No. 15-066 (Eastern Edge Development)

2325 Venable Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of a new mixed-use building on a vacant lot in the Union Hill Old and Historic District at the corner of Pink and Venable. The proposal is for the construction of a three-story building with commercial on the first floor facing Venable Street and residential at the rear along Pink Street and on the second and third floors.

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

Mr. David Johannas, with Johannas Design Group, and the owner of the property, Mr. Michael Magnes with Eastern Edge Development, came up to give a presentation. Mr. Johannas stated that he is not sure what the materials are going to be yet and stated that they were possibly thinking about changing the roof form a little bit and looking at some other alternatives between the two masses on Pink Street. Mr. Johannas stated that they might try to change the roof form so that it would be a butterfly roof in which the roof slopes upwards in opposite directions from the lowest point at the center.

Mr. Bond stated that on the elevation drawing it says view looking south but states that he sees a north elevation and an east elevation and inquired if it was correct. Mr. Johannas stated that it was incorrect.

Mr. Green inquired about the butterfly roof line proposal, and Mr. Johannas stated that he really had not gotten that far and stated that they wanted to raise the front and back section up a little bit so it could be butterflyed.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor asked about the concrete looking hatch at the window sills, the head and the hyphen between the two and inquired what the material is intended to be. Mr. Johannas stated that in terms of the heads and the sills they are thinking of an alternate masonry something that is complementary to the brick and stated that it might be a split face block or a larger 8 inch brick to create a variation in form. Mr. Johannas stated that in the middle of the block facing Pink Street, the thought was to use stucco but they are also considering incorporating something reflective of the warehouse design aesthetic and may try to incorporate metal into the building. Mr. Johannas stated that another way is to use cementitious siding and reduce the exposure very dramatically with small enclosures to keep the variation between two.

Mr. Yates inquired if along Pink Street toward the rear of the building on the first floor would be residential, and Mr. Johannas stated yes and stated that the variation in height occurs from the Venable side of the storefront versus the residential side dropping down on the first floor level.

Mr. Elmes stated that the subject lot is immediately adjacent to this incredibly dark red brick building and inquired about the shade of the proposed light brick and if they were going with a white brick. Mr. Johannas stated that they haven't decided on what color they are going with yet and that maybe they will go with a red, beige or brown tones. Mr. Elmes stated that in the application it talks about using a lighter shade and stated that when you look at the streetscape going up to the huge big red brick building from the

lighter painted brick structures, the subject property could be a bridge between the two. Mr. Johannas stated that keeping it red would be the bridge. Mr. Elmes stated that the color has to be really well flushed out along with the reflectivity possibility with the metal panels or the cementitious siding.

Mr. Michael Magnes stated that they were discussing maybe a yellowish type of brick to go with the red brick to create a variegated brick pattern in that area and stated that they want to not mimic what is across the street because that building is large and oppressive and he would like the subject development to be a lighter structure. Mr. Magnes stated that they might just go with the traditional red brick.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the cementitious siding would also be lighter in color, and Mr. Magnes stated that there are many buildings that have this contrast between red brick and wood siding.

Mr. Johannas stated that they are trying to have some separation and stated that the colors will vary and not be the same as the cementitious on both sides.

Mr. Bond stated that all the little houses that stretch that are next to the corner have porches and porch roofs and stated that they didn't chose to put that porch roof on the elevation labeled view looking west. Mr. Bond stated that on Venable Street view looking south they sketched in the little houses in scale but states that they didn't show the porch roofs which seems to be a pretty important scale given feature. Mr. Johannas stated that those are just some modern little sheds that were put on those structures. Mr. Bond stated that every house down there has a porch roof and inquired if that was something that they were trying to work with, and Mr. Johannas stated no. Mr. Bond stated that it might help to show that so they can understand what they are trying to do. Mr. Bond stated that they have a storefront that comes up to a cornice but stated that there is no reason for the cornice to be where it is, and Mr. Johannas stated that it is just a storefront. Mr. Bond stated that there is a roof over it and inquired if the cornice line is supposed to pick up that line of all the roofs that stretch all the way down to Venable Street. Mr. Johannas stated no.

Mr. Yates stated that he is concerned that in the drawing looking west the relationship of the setback on the 3rd floor and as you drive up Venable Street everything is 2 stories until you get to the large warehouse. Mr. Yates states that he thinks respecting that setback of the existing houses will go a long way to help modulating the difference between the 2 story houses and the 4 story commercial building. Mr. Yates stated that they should bring the third floor setback further back to align with the houses.

Mr. Dave Sirius state that he has properties on this block came up to say that he is excited to see something come on this block and is in support of the project.

Ms. Nancy Lambert who lives in Union Hill came up to discuss her concerns about the visual impact and setbacks.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Hughes stated that as far as the butterfly roofline he like something that is a little different as it will help distinguish it as a new building without it being too flamboyant. Mr. Hughes stated that it is a nice touch and is a different architectural feature. He stated that going down Pink Street the applicant should address the street and make sure it is pedestrian friendly. He further stated that he likes that the corner is cut in so that they are addressing the corner as opposed to one street or the other and stated he likes

where the project heading.

Mr. Bilder stated that it looks beautiful, has the human scale elements, and adds to the neighborhood. Mr. Bilder stated that the height is appropriate as there is a 5 story building next door and there are a lot of other taller buildings as you move down the street. Mr. Bilder stated that Better Housing Coalition school building that is being renovated is 4 stories that some of the other projects around there are taller. Mr. Bilder stated that the building is on the corner and should have some prominence and stated that they have the appropriate use of materials for the district.

Mr. Elmes stated that the fact that it does represents the contemporary yet compatible spirit of new construction is greatly appreciated. Mr. Elmes stated that it is successfully addressing Venable and Pink Street and that he does think the hyphen should be punched in a little to give it more feel to Pink Street feel less narrow. He stated that with that same thought that the rear addition be stepped back to feel less confined. Mr. Elmes stated that the project is a bookend more than it is a unifying element of the block and that Materials can be different because of this. Mr. Elmes stated that the brick colors are important and use lighter colors will make it feel like a lighter corner. Mr. Elmes stated that he likes the step back version of the 3rd floor more than the one pushed up further because they are aligned with the roof lines of the adjacent buildings. .

Mr. Green stated that it is wonderful to see something built on this site and that he is concerned with the narrowness of the site which gives him concern about the elevations. Mr. Green stated that there is a lot of things going on and stated that he does not think they need as many moves for it to read cleanly. Mr. Green stated that it would be stronger if it was simpler and with fewer materials and a limited palette and stated that simplifying the design is going to make it a stronger bookend. Mr. Green stated that he is really torn about the 3rd story on Venable Street because the buildings on the block are so simple and small.

Mr. Yates stated that it is wonderful to see something on that site and stated that he likes the contemporary way that they are handling it. Mr. Yates stated that 3rd floor at the front needs to align with the existing properties strong prominent street wall.

Mr. Bond stated that the 3 stories work fine and stated that they should pay attention to the porch level because it gives a scale that links it into the existing houses on the block. Mr. Bond stated that on that side that faces the houses they can let the storefront turn towards the existing homes and it could be a benefit. He also stated that they can always manipulate the materials.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she agrees that the stepback should lineup with the existing houses which is a good move but states that she is concerned with the butterfly roof design because it will create an even taller façade than already exists. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she wonders how low the roof can get in the middle to get the front down and stated that she agrees with limiting the materials. She is excited to see the project because it will add a lot to the neighborhood.

Mr. Hendricks stated that fine and simple clean detailing will really make it shine because the row houses are very simple and clean with flat roofs.

Mr. Magnes stated that a lot of buildings in this area the back side of the building are often ignored and thought the butterfly behind it will give it more activity.

Application No. 15-041 (W. R. Jones)

425 N. 25th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new mixed-use building on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The proposal is for the construction of a two-story building with commercial on the first floor and residential on the second floor with roof access and decks above.

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

Mr. Russell Jones, the owner, came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the conditions in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a friendly amendment that the first floor door openings need to be done to have some rhythm or relationships between the openings on the first floor and second floor and that it be delegated to staff.

After further discussion the motion passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new mixed-use building, and
 WHEREAS, the applicant improve the relationship between the first and second floor openings on the north elevation and that any changes made to these openings shall be reviewed and approve by Commission staff, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bond, Yates, Elmes, Green, Hughes, Hendricks and Aarons-Sydnor
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-056 (M. Ryan)

417 Catherine Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval for work performed at this property in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District, which includes the installation of a new porch railing. Staff does not recommend approval of the project. Staff recommends that the applicant either return the porch railing to what was previously installed on the structure to match the row houses on either side, or if this would not be in compliance with building code, that the applicant return to the Commission with a new porch railing design that consists of Richmond Rail.

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

There was no applicant present.

Mr. Bond stated that the recommendation is that the railing on the left look like the railing on the right. Mr. Palmquist stated yes and that they used to look like the other ones. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant is working with them to come up with a solution and that it would be best if the applicant came back with a Richmond Rail design that is enclosed with a top and bottom rail.

Mr. Elmes stated that the current railing could work if it was flipped around the other way and if the balusters weren't clipped at the bottom.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to deny the application and recommend that the applicant install Richmond Rail on the front porch and deferring review and approval to Commission staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 6-1-0(Aarons-Sydnor opposed).

The meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Marianne Pitts

Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review