



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, October 27, 2015

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### 1 Call to Order

Mr. Yates called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m

### 2 Roll Call

**Present --** 7 - \* Matthew Elmes, \* Joseph Yates, \* Gerald Jason Hendricks, \* Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, \* Nathan Hughes, \* James W. Klaus and \* Andrew Ray McRoberts

**Absent --** 2 - \* Sanford Bond and \* Bryan Green

### 3 Approval of Minutes

**ID 15-009** August 25, 2015 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** August 25, 2015 Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that the August 25, 2015 meeting minutes be approved.**

**Aye --** 5 - Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Klaus

**Excused --** 1 - Elmes

**Abstain --** 1 - McRoberts

**ID 15-010** September 22, 2015 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** September 22, 2015 Meeting Minutes

**A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that the September 22, 2015 meeting minutes be approved.**

**Aye --** 5 - Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Klaus

**Excused --** 1 - Elmes

**Abstain --** 1 - McRoberts

### 4 Other Business

National Registry Approvals

Ms. Pitts read the nomination for the Jerman House located at 24 Hampton Hills Lane and stated that the Commission already made the recommendations regarding this

property. Ms. Pitts stated that there has been changes made that very minor and stated that the period of significance have been extended until 1941. Ms. Pitts stated that the the nomination is focused more on the architecture than the history behind it.

Ms. Chen read the nomination for the Byrd Park Court which was built in 1921 and it consists of 12 dwellings. Ms. Chen stated that they meet the criteria C for its architecture, and staff supports the recommendation.

Ms. Chen read the nomination for the Carillon Historic District which is a National Register District consisting of 500 properties. Ms. Chen stated that it has a period of significance from 1889 to 1977 and stated that it has been nominated under criteria A for its social history in the Civil rights movement. Ms. Chen stated that it is also nominated under criteria C for architectural and community planning. Ms. Chen stated that this one has a criteria consideration which is an exceptional measure of significance for criteria G which means that it achieved significance in a period of less than 50 years.

Ms. Chen stated that the last nomination is for the Williams Byrd Park which has about 275 acres and was established in 1874 as a new reservoir. Ms. Chen stated that it is nominated under the criteria A for the significance in the areas of Community Planning and Development and criteria B for its association with Col. Wilfred Emory Cutshaw. Ms. Chen stated that the C criteria for consideration for the Shields- Robinson private cemetery within the boundaries and criteria F consideration because there are many commemorative monuments within the district. Ms. Chen stated that she recommends approval of this nomination under criteria A, B and criteria consideration for C and F.

Mr. Yates inquired if the incredible row of houses on the west side that faces the park can be their own separate historic district and Ms. Chen stated that they are included in the Carillon.

Mr. McRoberts inquired about the houses on Spottswood and Westover road, and Ms. Debra McClane stated that those blocks are in William Byrd Terrace which is not included in the William Byrd Park or Carillon National Registry Nominations. Ms. McClane stated that she has been thrilled to work on the nominations before the Commission and stated that a lot of the work that was done by Mr. Tyler Potterfield who helped the William Byrd Association gather a lot of information. Ms. McClane gave a brief history about the William Byrd area.

Mr. McRoberts inquired if the pump house was on the National Register and Ms. McClane stated that it was already on the nomination. Mr. McRoberts stated that these are important historical resources and stated that he commends staff and everybody that worked on this and the fact that Mr. Potterfield worked on it warms his heart.

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to recommend approval of the register nominations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0.

#### Secretary's Report

Ms. Pitts discussed the calendar for next year CAR meetings and quarterly meetings. Ms. Pitts stated that she had a discussion with the Planning Director who is interested in the Commission speaking more about new construction projects and stated that possibly at the next quarterly meeting devoting that meeting to a discussion about new construction projects. Ms. Pitts stated that the Historic Richmond Foundation has developed a survey for discussing new construction projects.

Ms. Danielle Worthington, of the Historic Richmond Foundation, stated that they are

working on a survey, and they are looking for feedback from the Commission and community on what they would like to see regarding new construction. Ms. Worthington stated that she wants find out if people are happy with what the Guidelines for new construction and if they are happy with the way they are being interpreted. Ms. Worthington inquired if the Commission wants them to add something or rewrite something to let her know.

Mr. Yates inquired if there was a deadline on the response time, and Ms. Worthington stated no and stated that they just want feedback.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were sending the survey to everyone in the City's Old and Historic Districts, and Ms. Worthington stated that they haven't figured out how they were going to circulate it yet and stated that they might distribute them at meetings and put them up on websites for feedback. Mr. Elmes stated that the issue of marketing the Commission in general has always been problematic and stated that of the problems they hear all the time is that people did not know they were in an Old and Historic District. Mr. Elmes stated that they should engage this to everyone in the Old and Historic District.

Mr. McRoberts stated that this may be a good way to do some education.

Mr. Elmes stated that one of the biggest issues that he has had since he has been on the Commission is the lack of general knowledge about the Commission.

Mr. Hughes stated that the survey should start with "do you know that you are in an historic district?"

Mr. McRoberts stated that it is important to put on the cover page that says congratulation you are in an old and historic district and ask them questions about their knowledge of the old and historic districts.

Ms. Pitts stated that they also discussed going before council and the Land Use Committee with an annual report and stated that they are on the agenda for November 17th. Ms. Pitts stated that the Maggie Walker Plaza will be coming before the Commission and stated that they are on a tight deadline and stated that they hope to get some feedback before the meeting from the public forums that they will be having. Ms. Pitts stated that she will get the meeting information to the Commission members. Ms. Pitts stated that at the quarterly meeting they discussed whether or not to require conceptual review for new construction projects and stated that they were going to bring it back up at an actual meeting.

#### Administrative Approvals

Ms. Pitts distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 53 approvals for the period from September 23, 2015 through October 22, 2015.

#### Enforcement Report

Ms. Pitts stated that there was concern from the community for a residence at 2003 Venable Street which has several issues including signing, lighting, satellite dish, painting and exterior modifications. Ms. Pitts stated that they were issued a Notice of Violation and stated that the applicant called and said they were going to put in an application but as yet they have not heard from them. Ms. Pitts stated that they will be going forward with the next steps of issuing a summons. Ms. Pitts stated that they have issued several other enforcement items and they will show up at the next meeting.

Mr. McRoberts inquired if the Commission had enforcement powers and inquired about the procedure and Ms. Pitts stated that citizens contact them when people are doing work without Certificate of Appropriateness and they go forth with the citations. Mr. McRoberts inquired if they go through Code Enforcement and Ms. Pitts stated that they do their own enforcements.

Other Committee Reports

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Elmes inquired if the terrazzo surface at 2225 Monument Avenue was replicating what is existing currently and Ms. Chen stated yes that was in the intent. Mr. Elmes inquired if the replacement was approved by staff and Ms. Chen stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if it was terrazzo and Ms. Chen stated yes and stated that it is extremely eroded.

**A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts, seconded by Mr. Elmes, that the consent agenda be approved with staff's recommendations.**

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

- 1 [CAR No. 2015-124](#) 312 N. 29th Street - Remove kitchen window

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

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

- 2 [CAR No. 2015-126](#) 2225 Monument Avenue - Reinstall terrazo porch flooring

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

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

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 3 [CAR No. 2015-125](#) 2712 E. Franklin Street - Replace porch decking and railing

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to rehabilitate the front porch of the structure by replacing the wooden deck boards with composite boards and replacing the existing metal pipe handrail with a PVC railing on a property located in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends

the approval of the installation of handrails with the condition that the handrails be metal or wooden, meet the requirements of the Commission's Guidelines for Administrative Approval Handrails and Porch Railings, and be reviewed and administratively approved by staff.

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

Mr. Elmes inquired if they have a baluster sample and Ms. Pitts stated no.

Mr. David Klinger, representing the owner, came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

**A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Hendricks, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the condition that the applicant work with staff to determine an appropriate substitute material for the handrail that has a less glossy finish.**

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

- 4 [CAR No. 2015-127](#) 2316 W. Grace Street - Replace 2 windows on the 2nd story of the facade

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval for work which included the replacement of two historic windows on the second story of the building's façade in the West Grace Street Hill Old and Historic District. This application is the result of enforcement activity. Staff stated that the windows were replaced without approval from the Commission and staff did not have the opportunity to determine if the windows were in poor condition or beyond repair. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Ms. Faye Browning the owner stated that she closed on the property in August and did not know that there were violations on the property and neither did the previous owner realtor. Ms. Browning stated that she would like some consideration if at all possible and stated that those windows are not evident from the street. Ms. Browning stated that she went up and down the street and found a number of houses that would not be in compliance with this and stated that there are houses on this street that have metal awnings. Ms. Browning stated that if all possible she would be grateful for any kind of consideration because it is something that she inherited and at the same time she see violations on that street.

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

Mr. Hughes stated that the mitigating factor is that it's on the second floor and stated that they have to enforce the Guidelines.

Mr. Elmes stated that W. Grace Street became district in 1996 and stated that there is a pretty reasonable chance that a lot of the violations that they do see could be pre-district

and stated that the worst type of application is an enforcement application especially for a new owner of a property that wasn't aware of the situation that existed before hand. Mr. Elmes stated that typically they have given consideration for that fact and stated that while it will be great if a motion could be formulated that would allow the applicant to have the opportunity to replace the sashes with wooden ones.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application against staff's recommendation whereas the windows could stay in place based only on the fact that the applicant is a new buyer of the property but would highly recommend that owner would consider replacing them with wooden sash as that they confer with staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus and failed 3-4-0 (Aarons-Sydnor, Yates, Hendricks, Hendricks opposed.)

Mr. Yates stated that since he lives in the old and historic district he is sensitive to the issue of window replacement and stated that he has restored his share of windows as many of the other Commission members. Mr. Yates stated the windows are noticeable from the public right-of-way and stated that while he feels for the owner and understands her frustration, this seems to be a legal issue between Ms. Browning and the former owner. Mr. Yates stated that because it is on Grace Street and is on the front façade of the house he doesn't feel comfortable going against the staff's recommendation on this.

Ms. Aaron-Sydnor stated that she agrees and stated that the former owner is the one that really needs to deal with this problem. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she believes they need to maintain some kind of consistency especially since it's on the main façade of the house she don't think it's something they can accept.

Mr. Klaus stated that the reason he voted for the motion was that he did not know if the current owner will have the ability to go against the former owner and stated that he believes that it will fall on the current owner.

Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks that the realtor will take some responsibility for that.

Mr. Hughes stated that it is in the disclosure packet and stated that he sees some dilemma here but at the same time while they have a precedent for it as they have done in other cases he feels like if they say that they are encouraging people to make the change and dupe the buyer into going in so they want have to go through the process. Mr. Hughes stated that he feels that they are encouraging bad behavior just by making it okay.

Mr. Hendricks stated that they have come across several of these windows in this district and think that these are some pretty unique windows particularly along Grace Street and stated that they are an important feature of the house.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to defer the application to enable the homeowner to see if there is a way to deal with this with the previous owner and then come back to the Commission.

Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that while the owner is exploring the cost of wood replacement windows so they will have the information when they come back.

Mr. Hughes inquired why defer the application rather than deny it and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that if they deny it the applicant would have to do a whole new application.

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed

6-1-0(Elmes opposed).

Ms. Browning stated that she can't do anything to the previous owner once they have closed on the house.

Mr. Elmes stated that the previous owner received a notice of violation then they were aware of the violations.

**A motion was made by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred to enable the homeowner to see if there is a way to work with the previous owner before returning to the Commission.**

**Aye --** 6 - Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**No --** 1 - Elmes

5 [CAR No. 2015-128](#) 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 approval 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 a total height of 42". Staff recommends denial of the project.

Mr. Hughes inquired what change the applicant asked for from their previous approval, and Ms. Chen stated that instead of what was approved which was a reconstruction of the balustrade based on physical and historic evidence they want to install a metal railing behind it that would bring it up to code. Ms. Chen stated that they are proposing to install a paneled solid base to the balustrade at the bottom with the historic balusters on top of it.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that this design looks similar to the design that the Commission previously denied. Ms. Chen stated that one of the problems with the previous proposal was that there were no dimensions and it was a very rough illustration of what that balustrade would be and stated that the applicant was given the option by the Commission to bring back a more detailed drawing of what this balustrade would look like.

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

Ms. Polly Brooks stated that this is the same design that they had last month and stated that there were some concerns about the dimensions being provided so their contractor has provided some dimensions and detailed drawings. Ms. Brooks stated that they really feel that the incorporation of the original balusters helps to preserve the historic look of the railing using the wainscoting to build the height to get it to code while incorporating those original balusters that they were fortunate enough to find. Ms. Brooks stated that in their opinion it's more aesthetically pleasing than using the old original look with a metal railing behind it and stated that the metal railing will not look as aesthetically pleasing. Ms. Brooks stated that being able to preserve the look is their intention.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that it seems like they are entering into war of attrition based on arbitrary taste where the applicant is saying they like the way this looks and the Commission is relying on the Guidelines to disagree. Mr. Elmes stated that the way the Guidelines are written they are not supposed to say that looks better than the other one and ignore the Guidelines because they don't really matter. Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks the staff recommendations are pretty clear that there is physical and documentary evidence of the original appearance of the balustrade and stated that what they recommended in May is what they have recommended on Monument Avenue which also a fairly substantial street in the City of Richmond. Mr. Elmes stated that personally because of the way the Guidelines are written he cannot support the redesign of the handrail as presented due to the fact that there is photographic evidence of the original handrail. Mr. Elmes stated that in the attempt to not be an arbitrary in taste but to follow their own Guidelines that would be his feelings.

Mr. Yates stated that he knows of no other building on Monument or the Boulevard where this proposed balustrade system has been installed. Mr. Yates stated that in the case of a misunderstanding they are talking about a single horizontal rail above the existing railing that the building inspection has approved before or something that would support a code. Mr. Yates stated that he can't approve the proposed application.

Ms. Brooks inquired that if they would incorporate the original baluster height with only a single metal railing to make up the difference of the height, would not a small child be able to get through there. Mr. Yates stated that is a question that they will have to go through with building inspections.

Mr. Hughes stated that at the last meeting they made a motion to deny the application so they were pretty clear on what they wanted to see.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that if the applicant doesn't like the metal railing they can use glass. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to deny the application based on the staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 6-0-1(Klaus abstained).

The contractor inquired if having a single rail rather than your typical 4inch increments for safety situations and inquired if that was going to be up to the inspector. Mr. Yates stated that it is to his understanding that it will be up to the inspector to approve this or suggest another accommodation.

Mr. Elmes stated that the only other thing they could do is get a code modification for that and stated that with a single rail the baluster below would protect a small child or small animal from falling through.

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

**Aye --** 6 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and McRoberts

**Abstain --** 1 - Klaus

6 [CAR No. 2015-129](#) 512 W. 20th Street - Install porch railings on front porch



Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to install porch railings to the front and side of an existing front porch. This application is the result of enforcement activity for alterations to the front of the structure which included the removal of the original porch siding and the replacement of the siding, front door and porch posts and columns. Staff recommends approval of the installation of a wooden porch railing with the conditions that the railing include at least 2 inches by 2 inches square pickets and a top and bottom rail of an appropriate width as determined and administratively approved by staff. Staff further recommends that the installation of the porch railing shall occur only after the violation regarding the porch piers and columns has been abated. It should be noted that the property remains in violation until the applicant abates the violations for all modifications to the structure.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if their proposed pickets are  $\frac{3}{4}$  by  $1\frac{1}{4}$  and assume that the  $1\frac{1}{4}$  would be the face and Ms. Pitts stated yes.

Mr. Elmes inquired if there was an abatement consideration for the columns or was there a staff recommendation to abate another porch column and Ms. Pitts stated no. Mr. Elmes inquired if they approved the previous columns and Ms. Pitts stated no and stated that they denied everything.

Mr. McRoberts inquired if the violations with the door and air vents have been addressed and Ms. Pitts stated no.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that if they approve the application they can't do any work until the columns are installed. Ms. Pitts stated yes and stated that is why they added the conditions.

Mr. Elmes stated that the staff report as it reads staff recommends approval of the project with the condition and stated that staff didn't take issue with the installation of the beaded cedar shake siding and the replacement of the porch piers and columns. Mr. Elmes inquired if the Commission denied all of it and Ms. Pitts stated yes.

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

Mr. Chris Keck stated that the reason he filed for the porch railings was because he been in discussion with Mr. Parker Agelasto and he advised him to submit the railings as part of the appeal and stated that he knows that they have passed the 75 days and stated that in talking to Mr. Agelasto he thought it was still ongoing. Mr. Keck stated that he wouldn't have submitted the railings if he had to do all of the changes first because he can't install the railings without changing the columns and the piers.

Ms. Pitts stated that the City Council has 75 days to act on an appeal and no action was taken.

Mr. Hughes stated that they still need to get it into compliance and approved.

Mr. Elmes stated that they have extended the terms of compliance before. Mr. Yates stated that he does not think they have authority to extend an appeal.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the columns were a consideration at this point. Mr. Keck stated that if they could come to a compromise to keep the piers or the columns and stated that is hard for him to replace.

Mr. McRoberts inquired what their intentions are on the door and the attic vents and Mr. Keck stated that they are going back with a wooden door and stated that he is kind of confused because he thought he was still in the appeal process. Mr. Keck stated that they were trying to compromise with some of the items instead of redoing everything. Mr. McRoberts stated that perhaps a deferral of this and a recommendation to the applicant to come back to address all of the things.

Mr. Hughes stated that this one is a little sticky and stated that the staff recommendations were to approve.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated if the Commission as a body decides to approve it will move the process along and it will be one less item that they will have to approve.

Mr. Klaus stated that the only thing in the front of the Commission is the porch railing and the rest of it is still in enforcement.

Mr. Yates stated that he believes that staff is also recommending since the railing engages the piers that the wood columns and piers be a part of this.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that the door, railing and beaded siding itself were the big ticket items for him and stated that while the piers were changed from the original brick piers the smaller upper column design. Mr. Elmes stated that in going forward they might can meet in a middle ground if the handrail were to be replaced it should not be a standard Richmond rail but have a 2x2 baluster and a wider hand rail and wider bottom rail like the one that was originally there. Mr. Elmes stated that the siding should be replaced with non-beaded siding and the front door go back to a wooden door. Mr. Elmes stated that the columns themselves not clearly original don't really bother him to the same extent that the other Guideline inappropriate items do.

Mr. Klaus stated that perhaps the new columns could be painted the way they were originally and they will become less intrusive and standing out.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the only thing before them now is the railing and stated that they have had discussions about options and stated that they need the applicant to provide their proposal along with everything else. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they are only approving the railing and stated that the staff recommendation stated that it cannot be installed until the problems are taken care of and stated that even if they approve this application no action can be taken until the other violations have been taken care of.

Mr. Elmes stated that in an effort to come to a compromise situation he is looking for the middle ground between the real key elements that were there before. Mr. Elmes stated that as far as guiding the applicant to the next step and inquired if they were going to defer it to staff to discuss with the applicants and inquired where they go from here.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the application with the conditions in the staff report for the reasons stated in the stated report.

Mr. Hendricks stated that to him it seems strange that it is hinging on other violations being completed and stated that if the content was to show compliance it seems like the door or siding would have been the better choice. Mr. Hendricks stated that this is

troubling to him because it relies on completed work that has not been submitted for it to actually come into compliance. Mr. Hendricks stated that the application is not timed correctly and Mr. Elmes stated that it can't be time correctly if staff's further recommendation that only after the violation regarding the installation of the piers and columns have been abated. Mr. Elmes stated that you can't do one thing without the other and is wondering what the most important issues are.

After further discussion the motion was not seconded and failed.

Mr. McRoberts stated that he wanted to second the motion but states that he is troubled and stated that he like the idea of addressing the application in the front of them and approval and if the applicant do this it is better off than what they have here now. Mr. McRoberts stated that part of him wanted to second it but he was concerned because there are a whole lot of things that has been required and needs to be done. Mr. McRoberts stated that it would be preferable to have a plan to address all of the issues and stated that getting something done is better than nothing.

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to defer the application and ask the applicant to work with staff to more fully address the existing violations.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in her mind what's important is what's more pronounced and that is the proportion of the porch, the piers and the columns. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that changing the height of the piers and changing the width display of the columns probably the changes the character of the house the most.

Mr. Yates stated that he would concur with Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and stated that would be what he think is the most significant features of the front of the house.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes with the amendment that they try to give the applicant some guidance.

Mr. Yates stated that everything works as a whole and stated that the appearance of the porch is the primary feature of the front of the house. Mr. Yates stated that the piers, railing and columns are the most significant features of the house.

Mr. Hendricks stated that door with the beveled glass are a clear violation and the vents.

Mr. Elmes stated that he could live with the Hardi plank if the proportions of the house was to go back to a more similar vernacular of what was there previously.

Mr. Hughes inquired if the applicant only come back with something that addresses everything or would they be open to certain things.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it will be better if they had a comprehensive application so that they can see it all at once and get the whole picture.

**A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts, seconded by Mr. Elmes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred in order to allow the applicant to work with staff to submit a complete application addressing all the enforcement items.**

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

7 [CAR No. 2015-130](#) 2028 Monument Avenue - Install new doors, windows, and stairs at the rear of the structure

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to modify three openings on the rear of the dwelling located in the Monument Avenue Old and Historic District. The applicant stated that would like to install new steps from an existing rear porch. Staff recommends approval of the wood steps and denial of the proposed new doors and windows.

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

Mr. Tom Paul, representing 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. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved, approving the wooden steps and dneying the new window and door.**

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

- 8 [CAR No. 2015-131](#) 2123 E. Marshall Street - Construct new 2nd story deck and stairs

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

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

- 10 [CAR No. 2015-123](#) 725 N. 26th Street - Construct a two-story carriage house

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Application & Plans - September 2015](#)

[Site Map - September 2015](#)

[Staff Report - September 2015](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request approval to construct a two-bay two-story frame garage at the rear of this residential property in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. This application previously came before the Commission on September 22, 2015 where the Commission deferred the application and asked the applicant to return with a revised design for a smaller building to address issues with the scale of the proposed building and to include a site plan on a plat to assist with understanding the massing on the site. Staff does not recommend approval of the current project.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that if DPW said they would provide the curb cut what would

the material be and Ms. Pitts stated that it did not specify and stated that in the previous meeting the applicant stated that they would use brick.

Mr. Klaus inquired if the garage door was put toward the alley would the recommendation still be against because of the size of the building and Ms. Pitts stated that they two are separate concerns.

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

Ms. Deanna Lewis, representing the owner came up to answer questions and distributed some information. Ms. Lewis gave a lengthy presentation regarding the project description.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired what material the curb cut was made out of and Ms. Lewis stated that it will be cobblestone or brick.

Mr. Hughes stated that Ms. Lewis gave a thorough report.

Mr. Joe Monopoli, the owner stated that he has a letter with 50 names on it from his neighbors agreeing that this is a good project and stated that some are members of the Historic Church Hill Foundations. Mr. Monopoli read the letter into the minutes in support for the project from neighbors. Mr. Monopoli stated that the house at 609 N. 25th Street are putting up a carriage house behind their house.

Mr. Elmes stated that the garage door was a redesign and Ms. Lewis stated no and stated that the door is included in the packet from the first submission. Mr. Elmes inquired if the door was having a transom and Ms. Lewis stated yes and stated that it is a 9ft panel door that comes with its own built in transom. Mr. Elmes stated that there is no transom window on top and Ms. Lewis stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were using Jeld-Wen 1/1 windows and Ms. Lewis stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if the door was 2-bay door and Ms. Lewis stated yes with one single roll-up door. Mr. Elmes inquired if it was one big garage door with small transom panels and Ms. Lewis stated yes. Mr. Elmes stated that it going to be hard to see the roof and inquired what the roof materials are and Ms. Lewis stated that it will be TPO. Mr. Elmes inquired if all the exterior finishes will be with smooth Hardi panel, soffits and corner boards and Ms. Lewis stated that yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if front façade if they were showing floor heights and Ms. Lewis stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired what kind of brick they are using and Ms. Lewis stated that it will be old brick.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the light fixtures and Ms. Lewis stated that there will be 2 old fashion carriage lights on each side of the carriage doors. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that staff can approve that and Ms. Pitts stated that staff has the authority to approve it. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that one of her concerns was getting a better sense of their proportionality and spacing between the main house and the garage. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she appreciates that they have a site plan but states that they have anything that is full dimensions of the plan and stated that one of her concerns is that the garage is much closer to the house than its being shown. Ms. Lewis stated that they are pulling it back to the alley line.

Mr. Elmes stated that Ms. Aarons-Sydnor is saying that it is 24ft from the deck. Ms. Lewis stated that if they look at the survey Mr. Monopoli's fence line is does not go back to his property line and stated that she is taking everything back to property line to the alley.

Ms. Lewis stated that she didn't take into consideration that the deck would be part of the usable space since it was a platform deck and stated that she took the measurements back to the house.

Mr. Hughes stated that they are not arguing so much over the measurements but more of the visual representation and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated yes so they could understand the proportionality of it.

Mr. McRoberts stated that the proposal compared to the last time is to take the garage all the way back to the alley right of way and Ms. Lewis stated that was the original proposal and stated that she changed it from a 24ft tall shed roof to a gable roof with 22/22/24 in the middle and stated that they are still pushing it towards the alley and for the width of the yard. Ms. Lewis stated that they have given them a 24ft wide street side version and a 22ft wide street side version. Mr. McRoberts stated that the plans that he is looking at says that the base of the garage is right up against the 15ft right of way. Ms. Lewis stated that not going to be anything extremely decorative it will be just flashing and stated that it will be pulled an inch away from the property line to account for the overhang of the flashing.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if they presented this to the Zoning Department and Ms. Lewis stated that she did talk to zoning and stated that they wanted to make sure everything was comfortable with CAR before they go there and stated that they don't anticipate any problems with zoning.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the contingency that the garage door as in the packet, the Geld-Wen windows as in the packet and that the siting on the property of the garage be based only on the site plan and survey dated 10-1-15 by Hardcore Associates.

Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that there will be no post between the garage doors and that the windows are in the garage doors and not separate transom windows above the garage door and that outside of the garage between the garage and the street be cobblestones or brick.

Mr. Klaus stated that they prefer 22ft wide as per this application.

Mr. Hughes stated that they could defer the lights to staff.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the colors and Hardiboard to be deferred to staff. Ms. Lewis stated that paint color will match the original house and stated that it is a deep green color.

Mr. Hendricks stated it bothers him that the garage door head is not the same height as the rest of the heads on the windows and doors on that level and Ms. Lewis stated that it sits a little bit higher because it's more of a safety issue. Mr. Hendricks stated that he was thinking that the garage door could be a little higher and make the windows smaller. Ms. Lewis stated that they can do an 8ft tall door. Mr. Hendricks stated that he is concerned that there is a big blank forehead in between the head of the garage door to the windows above it.

Mr. McRoberts stated that if it the mood of the Commission to approve this in some form perhaps deferring it and have staff come up with some conditions would meet the discussion of the Commission might be a better idea.

Mr. Hughes stated that per the new construction Guidelines for residential outbuildings it is supposed to mimic what the primary building is not necessarily what buildings are in

the area. Mr. Hughes stated that it helps minimize the height which is a good thing.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the plans show a 7ft tall door and an 84 inch dimension and right below it there is an 18 inch dimension and Ms. Lewis stated that the dimensions are for the brick. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired are they supposed to add them up to get the head of the door and Ms. Lewis stated yes. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated then the door is 8 ½ ft. tall and Ms. Lewis stated yes.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the windows on the second floor will be 33" by 70" and Ms. Lewis stated that they have to be shorter because they dropped the roof line by 2ft.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he would be more comfortable deferring this and getting some more dimensions on the new proposed plan.

After further discussion there was no second to the motion.

**A motion was made by Mr. Hendricks, seconded by Mr. McRoberts, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred pending more information on the elevations and more details on the materials and on the 22' wide new proposal. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a friendly amendment to clarify that more information means dimensions. Mr. Hendricks clarified dimensions on the windows, garage doors, head and sill heights.**

**Aye --** 6 - Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**No --** 1 - Elmes

**9**    [CAR No. 2015-132](#)    508 N. 26th Street - Reconstruct front gable

**Attachments:**    [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to reconstruct the front gable of a brick Queen Anne structure in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The applicant proposes to install ¾ smooth plywood painted to match the surrounding brick into the triangular opening and reinstall the historic galvanized metal decorative sunburst panel onto the plywood. Staff recommends approval of the proposed reconstruction of gable to include the reinstallation of the sunburst panel with the condition that the gable be constructed of brick to match the historic gable not plywood.

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

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

**A motion was made by Mr. Elmes, seconded by Mr. Klaus, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the conditions that the gable be reconstructed out of brick to match the historic gable and that the reinstallation of the original decorative sunburst panel be done.**

**Aye --** 7 - Elmes, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

## Adjournment

Mr. Yates adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.