



Meeting Minutes - Final
Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

1 Call to Order

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

2 Roll Call

Present: 7 - Matthew Elmes, Bryan Green, Joseph Yates, Jennifer Wimmer, Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, Nathan Hughes and Joshua Bilder

Absent: 2 - Sanford Bond and Gerald Jason Hendricks

Staff Present

James Hill, PDR
William Palmquist, PDR
Tara Ross, PDR

3 Approval of Minutes

[ID 14-052](#) November 25, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [November 25, 2014 Meeting Minutes](#)

Ms. Wimmer provided edits to the draft minutes to provide clarity on several statement.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Ms. Wimmer, that the minutes from the November 25, 2014 meeting be adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Elmes, Green, Yates and Wimmer

Excused: 1 - Aarons-Sydnor

Abstain: 2 - Hughes and Bilder

4 Other Business

Secretary's Report

Mr. Hill stated that they succeeded in putting together the December agenda in a two-week turn around and that they appreciate the Commission's steadfastness in attending two meeting in a compressed time period. Mr. Hill stated that for the December 2015 meeting they are going back to having the meeting on the third Tuesday. Mr. Hill stated that they are on track to issue the new edition of the Guidelines and that Mr. Palmquist has worked with them with the changes to the New Construction Guidelines. Mr. Hill stated that in the current edition it's very logical on facing pages and

it is easy to apprehend when you are looking at the sections on facing pages. Mr. Hill stated that from now on if there are changes that need to be made they can do it by substituting pages and posting the updates to the City's website. Mr. Hill stated that the new construction applications are reviewed by using the new Guidelines and that the Commission will have the new updated Guidelines before the January meeting.

DISCUSSION ON OAKWOOD HEIGHTS

Mr. Hill stated that after a long period of time, work has begun on the Oakwood Heights project and that CAR staff has been working with them. Mr. Hill gave a brief history of the project and stated that the Commission denied the Conceptual Review but City Council overturned their decision and approved their conceptual design. Mr. Hill stated that they told the applicants that it would have to come back to the Commission unless staff could determine that it was substantially in conformity with the conceptual drawings but to understand that there will be additional details or some slight changes. Mr. Hill stated that they looked at a number of different iterations and they had them eliminate some things and put some things back and told the applicants that they can't have a blind bay where they had windows before. He stated that it had to have the same massing components. Mr. Hill continued with an overview of the project and stated that the 3326 E. Broad Street house that was on the property was supposed to be preserved and incorporated into the new construction. Mr. Hill stated that once the construction began, they started getting calls that the building was leaning and that they were tearing it down but that they went out and they hadn't touch it. Mr. Hill stated that later on the building had been striped to bare studs and that on the drawings that they reviewed it was a note on it that stated that they were supposed to restore the façade of existing the building. Mr. Hill stated that at this point it can't be a restored façade. It will have to be a recreated façade of the building. Mr. Hill stated that he is working with the architect to ensure that the façade is a part of the street scape and that it is a reconstruction of the reinstalled cornice and porch posts. Mr. Hill stated that he is not pleased with the way that this has proceeded and that at this point the best that he can do is work with the Commissioner of Buildings to insist that they recreate the façade from the photograph.

Mr. Hill and the Commission member briefly discussed issues on the Oakwood Heights project.

Administrative Approvals

An Administrative Approvals report was issued to the Commission for their review.

Enforcement Report

Mr. Palmquist stated that they have received a report on the 900 block of N. 25th Street where the porch railings were replaced.

Other Committee Reports

UDC REPORT

Mr. Green stated that there were two UDC project approvals, one for new city standard bike racks and a final approval of a telecommunications tower on Huguenot Road. Mr. Green stated that they were presented with elements of the new Bus Rapid Transit plan and that they are proposing station locations, three of which will fall in the Old and Historic Districts. He stated that they will not come to them with this review because they are deemed to be in the public right-of-way. The system will run from Willow Lawn to Rockets Landings. Mr. Green stated that he wanted to ask staff to make sure that they can see the designs of these as soon as possible.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Elmes inquired if sheet L3-00 has a picture of the fountain for Jefferson Park and Mr. Hill stated yes.

Ms. Wimmer made a motion to move item #10 for 2709 W. Grace Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda based on the revised drawings and the conditions in the staff report. Mr. Hill stated that the owner found a source of historic dimension tile. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 6-0-0.

A motion was made by Ms. Wimmer, seconded by Mr. Yates, that the Consent Agenda items be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer, Hughes and Bilder

Excused: 1 - Aarons-Sydnor

- 1 [CAR No. 2014-144](#) 501 N. 26th Street - Repair porch detail with new material

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

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

- 2 [CAR No. 2014-146](#) Section 17.05 Review of an installation of a decorative fountain at 1921 Princess Anne Avenue

Attachments: [CAR Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to CAR](#)
[Location Map](#)
[Application & Plans](#)

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

- 3 [CAR No. 2014-151](#) 4102 Hermitage Road - Restore standing seam metal roof

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

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

- 10 [CAR No. 2014-150](#) 2709 W. Grace Street - Restore missing porch to historic appearance

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

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

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer, Hughes and Bilder

Excused: 1 - Aarons-Sydnor

REGULAR AGENDA

- 4 [CAR No. 2014-133](#) 2818 E. Marshall Street - Restore facade, construct rear deck and balcony

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

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 at this property in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District.

Mr. Green stated that at the previous meeting there was a letter of objection for the second-story deck in the rear and Mr. Hill concurred.

Mr. Hill stated that they had a letter from a neighbor that supported the project but was concerned about a tree at the rear. Mr. Hill stated that there was someone who objected to the dimensions of the deck.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were rebuilding the box beam in the front of the porch and Mr. Hill stated that the applicant could answer that question.

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

Mr. Aaron Ogburn stated that he lives at 517 N. 27th Street and that he wants to bring this property back to its former glory. Mr. Ogburn stated that most of the things on the list that staff has recommended are fair and reasonable and that as far as the rear balcony, there is a landing and stair coming down as it exists right now. Mr. Ogburn stated that in regards to the front porch beam, he doesn't know if there are dentil moldings underneath and that he doesn't know what staff meant about keeping it plain. He stated that it would look really awkward next to two houses that have very extensive trim molding. Mr. Ogburn stated that he could put on some dentils and match what the neighbors have and that as far as the windows on the top, he was not going any higher than what they are and that they are going back to the width to match the bottom. Mr. Ogburn stated that doing the arches on the bottom windows is fine with him and that it will add more to the home itself.

Mr. Elmes stated that it looks like they have a modified metal hand rail and Mr. Ogburn stated that it is standard treated or Richmond Rail with a 2-by-6 top and 2-by-2 treated pickets. Mr. Elmes inquired if the front window head height is the same and Mr. Ogburn stated that the bottom sills are raised.

Mr. Ogburn stated that his goal is to have the same height of the windows as on either

side and that he doesn't want to add the arch over top of it.

Mr. Yates inquired why they are keeping the 1950's columns on the front porch and Mr. Ogburn stated that he didn't know he could change them.

Ms. Wimmer stated that if the applicant wishes to change the columns they can submit an application for the Commission to review.

Mr. Elmes stated that keeping the same window opening could be administratively approved and Mr. Ogburn stated that he prefer to keep it as it is. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were going to match the windows on the front on the first floor to the adjoining houses and Mr. Ogburn stated that they will match. Mr. Elmes inquired if they share staff concerns about getting a window that tall from the manufacturer submitted in the packet and Mr. Ogburn stated that they will be built to the opening.

Ms. Wimmer stated that there is no approved list of window manufacturers.

Mr. Green stated that Commission received a telephone comment objecting to the second floor deck for this project.

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

Mr. Yates stated that there is not enough evidence for this application for him to approve it and stated that he is confused. Mr. Yates stated that without some drawings or something he can't support it.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she still doesn't know what they are going to do with the porch under the awnings and that she is concerned that the deck is not going to meet the Guidelines.

Mr. Elmes stated that there are a lot of inconsistencies and that he would be amendable with them having jack arches with a small elliptical infill above it which is found consistently through the neighborhood. He stated that he concurs with Mr. Yates that there is presentation verses application.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she appreciates the applicant's desire to rehabilitate the house in conformance with the Guidelines but that they need a little more information and clarification on the application.

A motion was made by Ms. Wimmer, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred in order to give the applicant a chance to make revisions suggested by the Commission. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

5 [CAR No. 2014-140](#) 607-609 N. 29th Street - Construct two attached single-family residences

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

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct two attached single-family residences on vacant lots located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with

conditions.

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

Mr. Green inquired if the first floor windows were larger. Mr. Kennedy stated that the bottom is 6'-2" and the top is 5'-2". Mr. Kennedy stated that they were going to build into the berms with steps going up and keep it as low as they can.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were going to build some retainage on the front façade and Mr. Kennedy stated that they could do that. Mr. Elmes inquired if this typically would have a single connected front porch as opposed to two.

Ms. Wimmer inquired about the roof where the two hips come together and stated that the overlap shown does not appear to be constructable. Mr. Kennedy stated that he was okay with them being connected.

Mr. Green inquired if they were proposing a black TPO and Mr. Kennedy stated that it would be black TPO on the front porch.

Mr. Elmes stated that it will still be a hipped roof flattened out and suggested that it be a single light transom and Mr. Kennedy stated that would be no problem.

Mr. Green stated they should probably line up the top of the transoms with the top of the windows to bring everything in line because right now the windows are four-inches over the transoms.

Mr. Bilder stated that he doesn't think this is an accurate depiction of what this would look like when it is finished and that he doesn't think this picture is accurate to this scale. He stated that it is much higher than what is depicted here. Mr. Bilder stated that he agrees with Mr. Elmes that a retaining wall is going to have to be built and that he doesn't see the drawings for the cornice and is not sure what the reveal is. He stated that that they need more information with the design. Mr. Bilder stated that he doesn't have enough information and recommends denial of the project.

Mr. Kennedy inquired what Mr. Bilder mean about the drawing not showing the right building and Mr. Bilder stated that there obviously needs to be a retaining wall built there and that it looks like they need about 10 or 15 steps to get to the front door and that is not showing here. He stated that he doesn't think this is accurately done.

Mr. Green inquired about the relative elevation to the rest of the houses and Mr. Kennedy stated that they wanted to have enough crawl space to run duct work and things like that. Mr. Kennedy also stated that on the berm he was focused more on the house and historic parts and trying to keep up with the neighborhood and hadn't thought much of the berm. Mr. Green inquired once you get up on the berm does the site slope down or up and Mr. Kennedy stated that it is pretty flat with a slight grade to the right but isn't really significant. Mr. Green stated that there might be some opportunity to reduce that a little bit, still giving them some operable crawl space. Mr. Kennedy stated that it is tough to do the exact replication of what it is going to be on a photoshop drawing and that they tried to do the best they could.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the Commission purview is not only for the building itself but also how the building fits within its context and if they don't understand exactly how it fits on the berms they won't be able to understand how the height of the new construction relates to the adjacent heights. Ms. Wimmer inquired about the decking of the floor on the front porch and Mr. Kennedy stated that it will be 5 1/4" deck board. Ms. Wimmer inquired if it was tongue and groove and Mr. Kennedy stated no. Ms. Wimmer inquired if

the lattice work proposed was wood and Mr. Kennedy stated yes. Ms. Wimmer inquired about the windows and Mr. Kennedy stated that they will SDL 2-over-1. Ms. Wimmer stated that there is trim on the front elevation and not on the rear and side elevations and inquired if they were putting trim on all of the elevations or just the front and Mr. Kennedy stated that trim will be on all windows. Ms. Wimmer inquired about the reveal for Hardiboard and Mr. Kennedy inquired if five or eight-inch would be okay as far as the Hardiplank siding. Ms. Wimmer stated that typically for new construction it is not as significant as if you were replacing siding on an existing building. Mr. Kennedy stated that they will do an 8-inch wide clapboards and the reveal will be 6 ½" or 7 ¼".

Mr. Elmes stated that he would be interested in seeing how these relate to the ones on the other side of the house.

Mr. Yates stated that if the building is going to be lowered the only way he can see it being done is if they could cut the berm down and go back into the hillside to get a crawl space. Mr. Yates inquired if the houses are going to be built in the berm and Mr. Kennedy stated that the steps will be built in the berm.

Mr. Ryan Ramsey a resident at 1612 N. 29th Street stated that with most of his concerns he discussed them with Mr. Kennedy and got them hashed out but that he had some questions about the foundation and wanted to insure that the brick foundation was going to wrap around the entire house and have the brick piers up front. Mr. Ramsey stated that one item that may need some further consideration because the steps are going to be built into the berm and there also is going to be some steps leading up to the porch which he thinks is going to further thrust the houses further back onto the lot. Mr. Ramsey stated that he doesn't know if the applicant is willing to do some side entry steps that will lead up to the front porch so that the houses can be kept close up to the streets and maybe include that in the retaining wall also. Mr. Ramsey discussed the transom on the rear sliding glass door and detailed cornices for the project. Mr. Ramsey stated that this is going to be a great project and that he is really excited to see some new homes across from his.

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

Mr. Green stated that there needs to be more details in the cornice.

Mr. Bilder stated that it seems like this was thrown together and that there is not enough details or information and that he is not satisfied with this application as it currently is.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that there are too many discrepancies right now and that the stairs are the biggest issue for her and inquired how they are handled as well as how they are going to handle the retaining wall. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is unclear about the posts and what they look like and the change in the roof and stated that she thinks there is enough questions and changes that have come up today that it might be worthwhile to defer it.

Mr. Kennedy stated that one of the biggest challenges with a lot of the lots in this area is that there are a lot of flat areas and stated that there needs to be more details down there. Mr. Kennedy stated that he would love to get some kind of approval on the house and then bring some of the details on the berm and foundation for the retaining wall to staff. Mr. Kennedy stated that it will take some more surveying and measuring to get that information and that maybe that is a way they can work between the two.

Mr. Green stated that he likes the direction that the building is heading but that he does have some concerns about what is drawn and what is written in the details. Mr. Green

commented that he is not sure if the Commission can defer that much to staff and that the issues of elevation and grading are fairly substantial. Mr. Green stated that he is hearing concerns about the resolution of details within the buildings and to see consistency across what is being presented as well as a little more resolution about where the building is going to set on that berm and how the front stairs are going to interact.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the main issue is that if they approve something they want to know what they are approving and that right now they don't have a clear understanding of what they are approving from what has been presented.

Mr. Hughes stated that it needs to be cleaned up.

Mr. Yates stated that the elevation drawing appears that the cornice is 5' high and that is a little out of scale for houses this size.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application so that the applicant could return to staff with additional information. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes.

Ms. Wimmer added that she wanted to know the width on the front porch and what the gutters would be, along with details on the railings. Ms. Wimmer stated that she has some concerns with the compatibility of a non-tongue and groove front porch material and would like to see the colors for new construction.

Mr. Green inquired if they have ever approved non-tongue and groove on new construction and Mr. Elmes stated yes.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Hughes, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred in order to give the applicant a chance to make revisions suggested by the Commission. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Green, Yates, Wimmer, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes and Bilder

No: 1 - Elmes

6 [CAR No. 2014-142](#) 615 N. 29th Street - Construct new single-family residence

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a single-family residence on a vacant lot in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Mr. Palmquist stated that staff has a problem with the height of the building as well as some of the dimensions proposed, such as on the projecting bay. The front facing dimension is quite a bit wider than the other sides of the bay and the windows are wider as well whereas typically all sides of the bays are usually more uniform. Mr. Palmquist stated that the windows seems much larger on the front face as well so staff doesn't recommend approval of this project. Mr. Palmquist stated that there are a number of recommendations that staff will place on this application should it be approved which will include the installation of true or simulated-divided lite windows, smooth, untextured cement board siding, staff review of paint colors, front porch decking that is painted in the manner similar to the porch as well or painted or opaquely stained rear decking boards and steps. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant should

confirm what the dimensions of the windows are since there is some discrepancies with the drawings and project description. Mr. Palmquist stated that the applicant did respond to some of staff's concerns.

Mr. Hughes stated that looking at the plans as far as the bay, it looks like the front windows are larger than the two side windows. Mr. Palmquist stated that if you look at the floor plans you can see the dimensions for the windows and they are wider.

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

Mr. Zack Kennedy stated that after talking with Mr. Palmquist and knowing what issues Mr. Ramsey and Mr. Palmquist had with the height of the project, he wanted to get an idea of how this plan might be able to work. Mr. Kennedy stated that he apologizes for wasting the Commission's time and that it will look better in January. He stated that he would love to get some feedback. Mr. Kennedy stated that there are a lot of tall houses and that he doesn't think it is incongruent with what's across the street or on the other side of the white house. He stated that he would love to get some feedback from the Commission.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired why it's setback nine-feet and Mr. Kennedy stated that it is setback further because of the bay window and that they made the window in line with the front of those house. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if there will be an existing stair landing somewhere and Mr. Kennedy stated yes.

Mr. Green stated that the existing alignment is what you would typically see.

Mr. Ryan Ramsey, residence of 612 N. 29th Street, came up and stated that he has a concern with the setback and stated that he would like to see the houses lined up closer to the sidewalk. Mr. Ramsey stated that there are different styles of architecture on the block and that it is important that they reconstruct a story here that was lost 10 or 15 years ago. Mr. Ramsey stated that he is concerned about the height and would love to see some sort of elevation drawing of the existing house and how it relates to the proposed house. Mr. Ramsey stated that the photoshop drawing can be distorted easily and that he doesn't think it's a truly contextual depiction of what the house is going to look like. Mr. Ramsey stated that he would like to see some more information.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that he appreciate the attempt to use a different type of style because there are so many A-gable buildings that are a little unusual in that block. Mr. Elmes stated that the berm and the porch idea is important to the Commission as much as anything else because siting is a big issue and you want that streetscape to be maintained to some degree and with that being said, the 617 porch is built over the berm. Mr. Elmes went on to say that he doesn't think that without a zoning modification or something that those houses are going to line up because that porch is built out to 0 streetscape and the stairs go up, hit a landing, turn up, and go to the side. Mr. Elmes stated that he doesn't know if that form is necessarily consistent or necessary and thinks that an iteration showing the berm with the stairs and the setbacks would be appreciated so that the Commission can consider the siting of all three properties and how they relate to 617 and the next building which is set much further back than what they are proposing. Mr. Elmes stated that he would suggest that on the Queen Anne bump-out that there be a little more consistency in window sizes as it goes around on each side instead of having a really large front window.

Mr. Yates stated that this was an anomaly that was created prior to the district and

stated that he is not sure that he can support something that they have purview over because it wasn't a style that was prevalent in the district. Mr. Yates stated that a lot of these houses had tower roofs with mansards and that was a traditional way of handling a 3-sided bay with a roof rather than having a gable roof. Mr. Yates stated that he thinks the porch roof needs to terminate with the side of the house.

Mr. Green stated that any efforts to lower the crawlspace would be helpful. He stated that the applicant should take a look at the detailing in the cornice and that you typically don't see dentils in Queen Anne buildings. Mr. Green stated that he is not quite sure what is happening with the keystone and the peak of the pediment and that is not something you will see and doesn't do anything. He stated that you may find that a molding will give you a form that is much more in keeping and is easier to build. Mr. Green stated that bringing in the porch roof on the small porch and working on integrating this a little better would help. He stated that he echoes what Mr. Elmes said in that they are glad to see something that is not Italianate and they really appreciate the effort.

Ms. Wimmer stated that she appreciates the attempt at a different architectural style and encouraged them to not give up on it. She stated that it is really about proportion here and she would encourage the applicant to look at precedent images because there's nothing wrong with taking a classical form. Ms. Wimmer stated that you can have a classical form correctly proportioned and have a modern structure and that it is the proportion that gives it the beauty and would help make it compatible to other historical structure in the districts.

Mr. Bilder stated that he wants more information about the roofing materials, the window materials, the molding details and the door materials.

A motion was made by Ms. Wimmer, seconded by Mr. Yates, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred in order to give the applicant a chance to make revisions suggested by the Commission. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

- 7 [CAR No. 2014-145](#) 2402 E. Clay Street - Add storm windows and replace windows on side

Attachments: [Application & Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace the first-and-second-story windows on the front of this Classical Revival two-family residence in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green asked to clarify that the application stated that they wish to add storm windows on the front and replacement windows on the side. Mr. Hill stated that the applicant can clarify that. Mr. Green asked if they are asking for storm windows on the front which can be approved administratively and Mr. Hill stated yes. Mr. Green asked about the windows on the side, which they can't see and Mr. Hill stated that all but the front three side windows are not visible. He stated that if the windows are sound that the addition of storm windows and checking the glazing and caulking around the frame can help them achieve the value that they are aiming for. Mr. Hill stated that if the windows don't function well, very often it's because the sash cords are broken and often they find

the sash weights in the pockets and they will work well for another sixty years once they rehang the sash weights.

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

Mr. Joe Gross, the owner of 2402 E. Clay Street, stated that after talking to Mr. Palmquist he has an understanding of what is required and that obviously they want to be in compliance with all of their buildings in Church Hill. Mr. Gross stated that they are also trying to create an interior atmosphere that is going to provide good value throughout. Mr. Gross stated that he is for longevity of his tenants and provides the best living space possible. He stated that he met Mr. Elmes on the street and he gave him some clarification and some ideas. Mr. Gross stated that for the Velv-A-Lume storm windows up front, he sees no issues with it if that would preserve the integrity. He stated that as far as the side windows they are inoperable and that it is more than sash cords and stated that they have put a half an inch of bondo and caulking on it in order to be able to rent the place out. Mr. Gross stated that his goal would be to replace all of the side windows with Jeld Wen windows or the Lincoln windows or something where they can mimic the muntin bar on the side windows that you can see. Mr. Gross stated that it is very difficult to see anything on that sash from the first couple of inches and that he is trying to keep this project from being cost prohibitive. He stated that at the same time everything he has read said the R-value with storm windows are not anywhere near a double pane window.

Ms. Wimmer stated that there are films that are made that can be put on the windows that could improve the solar heat gain coefficient value of the windows.

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

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that they need some sort of evidence to prove that they are unrepairable before they approve replacing them.

Mr. Yates stated that on every other project where window replacement has come before them they have asked for a window assessment.

Mr. Hughes inquired if that was something that staff could handle and if they had any questions they could refer it back to the Commission. Ms. Wimmer stated that for window replacement it has to come before the Commission.

Mr. Elmes stated that if the three windows that are visible that are in bad shape can be replaced with other windows that are not visible and are in better condition, it could be approved administratively.

Mr. Green stated that depending on the condition they can replace it with another wooden sash.

Mr. Gross stated that he would need to put storm windows on the front and then on the other 3 windows that are visible and he could do whatever he wants on the other windows because they are not visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Green stated yes.

Mr. Green stated that if the applicant wishes to pursue replacing the windows then the Commission will need a window survey and the specific window that they are replacing it with.

Ms. Wimmer stated that the aim of the Commission is to preserve as much of the historic fabric as possible.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Mr. Bilder, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be deferred in order to give the applicant time to provide a full window survey and cut sheets or information on the proposed window replacement, as well as to seek storm window approval from staff. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

8 [CAR No. 2014-148](#) 610 N. 23rd Street - Construct new single-family residence

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

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single-family residence on a vacant lot in the Union Hill 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 with conditions.

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

Mr. Matt Jarreau came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates, seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions:

- That the front porch columns be turned, wood columns.
- That the proposed windows are 2-over-2 MW Jefferson 300 double hung windows with simulated-divided lites.
- That the second story windows align with the first story windows on the right elevation.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

Excused: 1 - Hughes

9 [CAR No. 2014-149](#) 2813 M Street - Revisions to approved quadraplex design

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

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct new quadraplex in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. Staff is recommending approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Matt Jarreau came up to answer questions.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Bilder, seconded by Ms. Wimmer, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved with the following conditions:

- That the siding will be installed between the two front window entrance doors.
- That the setback will match that of the house to the west.
- That the siding will be smooth, untextured, cementitious siding with a 6" reveal.
- That the windows will be 2-over-2 double-hung PVC cellular with simulated-divided lites.
- That the cornice will be revised to proportional dimensions similar to that found at 627 N. 28th Street.
- That the front porch roof will be black EPDM.
- That the stair rails will be Richmond rail.
- That the applicant will coordinate the review and approval of paint color and exterior light fixtures with Commission staff.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Elmes, Green, Yates, Wimmer, Aarons-Sydnor and Bilder

Excused: 1 - Hughes

OTHER BUSINESS

The Commission and Mr. Hill continued their discussion on Oakwood Heights.

Ms. Kim Chen and the Commission discussed the application process regarding completed applications.

Mr. Green stated that the Commission needs to take a look at the Guidelines' other sections.

Adjournment

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting at 6:53 p.m.