

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
MINUTES
November 25, 2014

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, November 25, 2014 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. Sanford Bond
 Mr. Mathew Elmes
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Ms. Jennifer Wimmer

Members absent: Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor
 Mr. Joshua Bilder

Staff Present: Mr. James Hill, CAR Secretary
 Mr. William Palmquist, DPDR
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

Mr. Green called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes:

The Commission stated that Mr. Todd Dykson should be “Dykshorn.” Mr. Bond made a motion to approve the October 28th minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Revisions to the Mural Guidelines

The Commission introduced, discussed and revised the Mural Guidelines. The Commission came to a consensus to strike number 6 from the Mural Guidelines.

Mr. Yates introduced a motion to approve the revised Mural Guidelines as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-0-0.

Secretary Report

Mr. Hill stated that he had a training session with Ms. Rebecca Aaron-Sydnor and gave her a copy of the current Old and Historic Review guidelines and with the adoption of the Mural Guidelines they will incorporate these into a new addition that also includes the new recently adopted revisions to the New Construction guidelines. Mr. Hill stated that the new construction staff reports were still modeled on the previous new construction guidelines and they are going to update the template that they use for staff reports to model the revised guidelines. Mr. Hill stated that they will start the New Year off with the new revised guidelines and updated template for review of new construction.

Ms. Wimmer inquired what guidelines were on the website and Mr. Hill stated that they are the previous ones and that they will be updated as well.

Mr. Hill stated that the property at 307 N. 21st Street, where the Commission approved demolition and reconstruction of a single-family house, ran into a zoning issue and must go to the Zoning Board and Appeals. They must meet the required 4ft setback and Mr. Hill stated that they drafted a letter of support on behalf of the Commission to the Board of Zoning Appeal and wanted to know if the Commission was willing to support the letter.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the first and last paragraph the word “Review” is missing from “Commission of Architectural Review.”

Ms. Wimmer introduced a motion to approve the letter of support with the revisions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Hill stated that they received a request for an extension for the appeal by the owner at 407 N. Allen Avenue and that staff was fine with the extension because they are working with them.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to grant the applicant the 75 day extension. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Mr. Hill stated that in regards to the window replacement at 21 W. Clay Street which was deferred from the last meeting, staff has been in discussion with the

owner and they are not replacing the windows but instead they are repairing them. Mr. Hill stated that they are withdrawing their application and will be installing Velv-A-Lume storm windows and which staff can administratively approve.

Mr. Hill discussed the dates for the 2015 meetings, the quarterly business meeting and the February date for the retreat.

The Commission members came to a consensus to discuss the dates at the next meeting to give Commission members time to look at their schedules.

Mr. Hill stated that they are having trouble filling the Secretary's position and that they are working with Human Resources to get someone in that position.

UDC

Mr. Green stated that there were three items on the agenda for the November 6th UDC meeting for final location, character and extent review, including a roundabout at the off-ramp from interstate 95 to the off-ramp at Grayland and the final review for the Richmond Police Canine Training Facility which received final approval, as well as a conceptual review for a telecommunications monopole at the Fire Station at 8800 Huguenot Road.

Administrative Approval Report

Mr. Hill distributed the Administrative Approval Report which covers most of 2014 and some unreported approvals from 2012 and 2013. Mr. Hill stated that now that staff is caught up with entering the back log of administrative approvals, future administrative approval reports will be more regular and current.

Enforcement Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that regarding 2300 Venable Street, they have been speaking with the owner's representative who will be submitting an application for the January meeting for the siding replacement and reconstruction of the storefront cornice. Mr. Palmquist stated that they also spoke with the owner of 823 Mosby Street who will be submitting an application for the January meeting. The applicant for 312 N. 33rd Street, which is the Lavaloft Apartments, will be removing their banner sign and therefore their item was removed from the meeting agenda. Staff issued an NOV at 10 W. Broad Street for non-approved signage. Staff will be issuing an NOV in the 600-block of N. 25th Street for a lot of changes over the years without any permits. They will be issuing an NOV in the 600-block of N. 27th Street for the replacement of porch columns and railings. Mr. Palmquist stated that they will be investigating the replacement of porch columns and siding in the 500-block of W. 20th Street and they are investigating the replacement of windows in the 600-block N. 21st Street. They are also investigating installation of some satellite dishes in the front yards in the 3100-

block of E. Broad Street. They have been working with the owner to complete an application for the ongoing work in the 400-block of N. 29th Street and they are trying to get a complete application and if that doesn't work out they will take the necessary steps. Mr. Palmquist stated that they are also looking into the installation of signage at 1600 Monument where the patio was approved a few months ago for a restaurant. There is some additional signage that may or may not have been approved.

Mr. Elmes inquired if there was any modification on a building permit or application for the N. 29th Street property and Mr. Palmquist stated no.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Elmes inquired about application #7 for 3412 E. Broad Street and asked if they were dictating the stain color and Mr. Palmquist stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to move item #14 for 2610 E. Grace Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda based on the comments in the staff report.

Mr. Yates inquired if there was still some question about the proposed porch railing and Mr. Hill stated that was one item for discussion and that they proposed a railing that is in more in line of a Colonial Revival railing. The house next door has columns that are turned down and don't taper. It is more in keeping with the spools and the spindle freeze and that was the only issue with that. Mr. Hill stated that the question was whether the proposed balusters were appropriate.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they will be able to source the metal shingles and Mr. Hill stated that they are planning to salvage the existing metal shingles.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and failed 2-4-0 (Elmes, Yates, Green and Hendricks opposed).

Mr. Bond made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Application No. 14-143 (J. Sadler)

401 W. Marshall 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-143 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposed to replace non-primary elevation with Hardiplank siding, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-126 (J. Molenkamp)

2035 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No. 14-126 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to enclose rear porch, remove rear spotlight and conduit, replicate missing downspout scupper, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-127 (D. Herring)

2306 E. Marshall 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-127 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace porch decking with composite material, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-128 (BAP LLC)

7 E. Broad 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-128 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to rehabilitate building exterior, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-129 (S.Caudle)

2209 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-129 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to demolish non-historic addition, add exterior door, and relocate front east gate, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
Negative: None
Abstain: None

Application No. 14-130 (117 Leigh LP)

119 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-130 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to restore storefront elevations and construct new infill portion, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-134 (Progress Realty Group)

3412 E. Broad 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-134 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct rear deck and balcony, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-136 (J. Heltzel & G. Hostelter)

403 N. Allen 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. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No.14-136 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. Yates seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace asphalt shingles to match color of surviving historic clay tile, 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: Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 14-120 (M. Morgan)

2307 E Clay Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct a single-family dwelling at a vacant lot located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District.

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

Mr. Hill stated that in the front of the packet there is a letter from a member of the public who had voiced their concerns regarding the project.

Mr. David Clinger, the architect, came up to answer questions and concerns.

Mr. Green stated that their question was about the massing of the side-wing stair tower and asked if he could explain any changes that have been made to modify or address the concerns. Mr. Clinger stated that they eliminated the room on the front and pushed the stair tower back 7 feet.

Mr. Elmes asked if there are other examples of this type of architecture in the immediate area and Mr. Clinger stated that not on that particular block but it is found in the next two blocks. Mr. Elmes inquired if that would include the metal railings and roof styles and Mr. Clinger stated that there are some that have metal iron railings and that they are willing to use wood and the owner wanted to do some decorative iron railings that would fit in the district. Mr. Elmes stated that with regards to the Guidelines, they don't feel that the massing relative to the square feet is larger. Mr. Clinger stated that he thinks it's within reason of the other surrounding properties and that they will fit it in just fine. Mr. Elmes stated that it is an unusual lot and the total massing on the front facade isn't quite as large and Mr. Clinger stated that with this size of massing that it fits in fairly well. Mr. Elmes stated that it is a large massing for the front façade. Mr. Clinger stated that he hoped that the recessing it back will help eliminate the massing.

Mr. Bond stated that he has a problem with the stair tower and it looks so tacked on that it doesn't look like part of the structure and wonders if there was a way to integrate it more into the house.

Mr. Green read the letter of rejection from the residents at 417 N. 21st Street into the minutes.

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

Ms. Wimmer applauded the applicant and the architect for choosing an underutilized style for new construction but states she agrees with the Commission members and that part of the issue is that the stair tower looks like it is supposed to be an addition but it is not subordinate to the main structure in

terms of massing. Ms. Wimmer stated that she also has an issue with use of materials in this instance and the fenestration patterns don't seem to be compatible at the stair tower, as well as beside and above the door.

Mr. Green stated that he would like to see the stair tower integrated fully into the building or expressed more shallowly as a feature and that this is just not something they see in the historic district.

Mr. Yates stated that most houses are narrower and he agrees that the scale of the windows are larger and if the fenestration was aligned between the first and second floor, it would help.

Mr. Bond stated that if they move the door over to the center, it might help align it.

Mr. Elmes stated that he wanted to know if this was compatible within the district.

Ms. Wimmer stated that it is a proportion and massing issue.

The Commission continued their discussion briefly and came to the consensus to defer the application.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application to give the applicant a chance to make revisions suggested by the Commission. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wimmer and passed 6-0-0.

Application No. 14-131 (Progress Realty Group)

3404 E. Broad Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single family dwelling at a vacant lot located in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Mr. Andy Beach, the contractor for the project, stated that he examined the information in the CAR Guidelines and that he believes the project complements, and fits into the neighborhood.

Mr. Bond stated that one drawing has nine risers and the other drawing has eight and the other has six. Mr. Beach stated that until they set the base of the walls, they can't determine exactly how many stairs there will be.

Mr. Elmes stated that the one floor says four-feet plus or minus.

Mr. Bond stated that he is curious where they are putting the first floor relative to the building. Mr. Beach stated that it will be four inches above the sidewalk at the front of the building.

Mr. Elmes stated that because there is a fairly strong linear comparison to the other homes, in a perfect world the porches and fenestration would all line-up. He inquired if the intent is to line up the porch with the other buildings to the east. Mr. Beach stated that they will align with the other houses. Mr. Elmes stated that because of the width of the house and the width of the front porch, the center column really jams up the whole front porch. Mr. Beach stated that he could remove that.

Mr. Green inquired if the porch will be covered and Mr. Beach stated that all of it will be covered.

Mr. Yates stated that most houses in this block have attics with a story over the front portion and that his issue with the design and is that it needs an attic story to be compatible along the block.

Mr. Green stated that they could add dormers for verticality and Mr. Beach stated that they could add a dormer over the bay.

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

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to defer the application to give the applicant a chance to make revisions suggested by the Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 6-0-0.

Application No. 14-137 (S.Traylor)

2610 E. Grace Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to repair and/or replace elements on both the front and rear porches at a residence in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project.

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

Mr. James Flanagan stated that they will be happy to work with staff.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application as outlined in the staff report with the caveat that the owner work with staff to model the profile style of the porch closely to that of the house to the west. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to demolish non-historic rear addition, rehabilitate front and rear porches, and

 WHEREAS, the applicant have staff review and approve a modified baluster design which resembles those of the neighboring house to the west which has turned, non-tapered balusters with square bases, 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-138 (Progress Realty LLC)

2025 Venable Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to demolish a non-original addition and construct a new addition in its place, as well as to rehabilitate the building's storefront and make site improvements at this property in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Todd Beach came up and gave a brief description of the project and their intentions.

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

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application as presented with the conditions in the staff report and that the applicant bring materials to staff and any changes can be deferred to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace frame rear addition with new construction, and
WHEREAS, the new addition is clad in cement board siding with a smooth finish with no faux grains, and
WHEREAS, the staff review and approve an appropriate paint color for the addition from the CAR paint color palette, and
WHEREAS, the applicant have staff review and approve the proposed fence and gate design, and
WHEREAS, the applicant shall submit any additional conditions imposed by DHR or the National Park Services to CAR staff for administrative review and approval, 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
Negative: None
Abstain: None

Application No. 14-139 (Mid Atlantic Comm. Properties)

535 W. Broad Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new commercial building and parking area in the Broad Street Old and Historic District. The proposed infill project appears generally to be in keeping with the Standards of New Construction and staff recommends approval of the project.

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

Mr. Barry Byrd came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented based on the conditions in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new commercial building and parking area, and
 WHEREAS, the permit drawings show the datum moved down to the level established by the proposed wood panels, 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Application No. 14-132 (Valley West LLC)

1914 E. Franklin Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of a new five-story multi-family apartment building that incorporates two levels of structured podium parking in the Shockoe Valley Old and Historic District.

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

Mr. George Ebersson stated they came to get feedback.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she agrees with all of Mr. Hill's comments and concurred that this appears more like a building suited for a commercial strip area rather than a manufacturing area. She also noted that what appears to be firewalls separating the abys is unusual for the district. Ms. Wimmer stated that rustification is on the ground floor and she is not sure if any is in this district. She stated that the fenestration patterns seem to be fairly consistent until you get to the top floor. Ms. Wimmer stated that along the lines of fenestration, the three big entry pieces looks like spandrel panels which is foreign to the district.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he was glad to hear that Land Use might be requiring some ground use and commercial space and stated that his biggest issue is with the parking garage on the first two floors over the entire structure and hoped that they get some more activity on the ground floor. Mr. Hendricks commented that they are not looking for the Juliet Balconies, they want something that is substantial and usable.

Mr. Bond stated that he finds the design to be a little frenetic and it's in an industrial area. He stated that the design can't figure out whether it wants to be a line of row houses, commercial space, or industrial space and that it needs to decide what it is. Mr. Bond stated that he would be happy to see something that is large and monolithic like an industrial building and that they don't have to use brick necessarily because it's a new building. Mr. Bond stated that there are new materials out there and that they still can have a massive building.

Mr. Yates stated that his concern is that there seems to be too much going on within the building and the other large buildings in the neighborhood are monolithic and carry a theme throughout the entire façade. Mr. Yates stated that it needs to calm down a little bit so that it fits better in the neighborhood and more closely resembles the historic factory buildings that are there.

Mr. Green stated that he would recommend that they simplify the design a little

and that the old CAR Guidelines encouraged people to do small bays and setbacks. He stated that they were seeing buildings that were approaching full city blocks faces, that actually worked against itself. By breaking it down into so many bays the building seems bigger and busier. Mr. Green commented that they were trying to encourage with the new construction guidelines that applicants create single large buildings or two large buildings. He stated that this neighborhood takes larger buildings really well. Mr. Green went on to say that that if it is simplified in character, the building can be really big and not feel like it's imposing on the neighborhood.

The Commission members encouraged the applicant to look at other large buildings in the neighborhood.

Mr. Elmes stated that in looking at this initially he remembered the E. Clay and 18th Street project where there was a lot of undulation moving in and out of the bays. He was unclear what was capping it and it seemed a little frenetic. Mr. Elmes stated that when you talk about compatibility in that area, there are a lot of different cues to take from and stated that he is not finding any specifically here in this design that really aligns itself to the other buildings surrounding it. Mr. Elmes stated that the form seems to be more suburban and that there is a lot going on. He stated that a lot of that could be the fenestration because he is having difficulty to see how the floors are aligned horizontally. Mr. Elmes stated that his issue is more with the compatibility issue and whether it fits with other building in the district. He stated that he doesn't have a lot of concern with the parking lot, but the building seems incompatible with the immediate structures because it moves in and out.

Ms. Wimmer stated that they will be interested to know where the HVAC will be going.

Application No. 14-123 (Progress Realty Group)

3000-3006 E. Franklin Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request for conceptual review and Commission comments for the construction of up to three attached, single-family dwellings at lots fronting East Franklin Street in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District.

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

Mr. Jeff Bunch came up to answer questions.

Mr. Bond stated that the garage is fine and stated that this is an unusual situation with an opportunity to do something a little different.

Mr. Elmes stated that the topography is flattened out and is a lot more dramatic in the back. Mr. Bunch stated that it does fall back but not as dramatic as the rest of the hill.

There was no public comment.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes stated that garages don't exist in the city and that it has to be detailed carefully to work. He stated that the overall form is fine and is similar to other forms. Mr. Elmes stated that it seem like there would be a natural joining of house there and the houses could be more like townhouses.

Mr. Yates stated that he appreciates the opportunity to go off the grid and doesn't know a single house in the city that has this configuration and that he has a problem with front facing garages. He stated that there are other ways to get around this issue.

Mr. Green stated that the general form of the house is fine but that he has a problem with a front garage because it's a foreign design in the district. He stated that they have not approved it in the past and stated that it will set a precedent for it. Mr. Green stated that he supports the building but not the garage.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he couldn't support a front facing garage.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the way to continue the urban fabric is to reinforce the use of alleys and streets.

Mr. Elmes stated that they appreciate the comments and that he doesn't know if they are going to have an opportunity to drive behind the building or have a yard in the back unless the parking is beside the house.

Application No. 14-118 (A. Watkins)

2109-2111 M. Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct two new single-family residences on two vacant lots located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Mr. Palmquist stated that staff is recommending approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green inquired if the rail will be painted or be a metal rail and Mr. Palmquist stated that it will be a wood Richmond railing.

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

Mr. Allan Watkins came up to answer questions and gave a brief description of the project and stated that they will be using Richmond rail.

The Commission members and applicant discussed the project.

There were no additional public comment. The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented and include a metal or membrane roof with Richmond rail on the porch and simulated divided lites on the windows. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 5-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct two new single-family residences, and
WHEREAS, the porch roof be metal or membrane roof, and
WHEREAS, that Richmond Rail be used for the balusters, and
WHEREAS, that the presented corbels and porch posts be installed, and
WHEREAS, the windows have simulated divided lites, and
WHEREAS, the windows installed reflect those shown on elevation drawings, 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, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
Negative: None
Abstain: None

Application No. 14-141 (E. Beecroft & N. Walsh)

2912-2912 ½ E. Leigh Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct a new single-family dwelling at two vacant lots located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Zach Kennedy came up to answer Commission questions.

There were no additional public comment.

The Commission discussion began

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to approve the application per the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 5-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new single-family residences, and
 WHEREAS, the approval only applies to the new front steps design, 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: Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Wimmer and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-133 (A. Ogburn)

2818 E. Marshall Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request to repair the front porch, replace windows and construct a rear porch and deck in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends the approval of the project with conditions.

Ms. Wimmer asked if the rear second floor deck is visible from the public right-of-way and Mr. Hill stated that he could make a recommendation that they use a closed Richmond Rail.

Mr. Green opened the floor for public comment.

There was no applicant present and there were no additional public comment.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 5-0-0.

Ms. Wimmer stated that they could replace the windows with 1-over-1 because it will be new construction.

The Commission deferred the application because of several questions and concerns for which the applicant was not present to discuss.

Mr. Hill thanked Ms. Kathleen Onufer and Ms. Kim Chen for helping them write the staff reports.

Mr. Hill apologized to the Commission for the snacks due to the keys being locked in the Executive Secretary's desk.

Mr. Elmes inquired about the house at 21 W. Clay Street. Mr. Hill stated that Old House is repairing each window and they are going to install Velv-A-Lume storm windows which can be administratively approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

James Hill

Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review