

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
MINUTES
September 23, 2014

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, September 23, 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. Joshua Bilder (arrived at 3:46)
 Mr. Sanford Bond
 Mr. Mathew Elmes (arrived at 3:39)
 Mr. Jason Hendricks

Members absent: Ms. Jennifer Wimmer
 Mr. Nathan Hughes

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 3:32 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. Yates inquired about whether Mr. Green abstained from the entire consent agenda. Staff stated that they will check into it and make corrections if necessary.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the August 26th minutes based on the Commission's discussion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 4-0-0.

Quarterly Meeting

The Commission came up with a consensus to have the Quarterly meeting at 6:00 p.m. at Mr. Bond's office at 3North Architects on October 7th.

Proposed Changes to the Review Guidelines

Mr. Green stated that at the August meeting they approved some changes to the New Construction Guidelines and stated that there was one set of comments that was sent in by a member of the public that was received after Ms. Easterling's departure and never forwarded to the Commission. Mr. Green stated that the notes the Commission members have before them for new residential construction are incorporating some of those changes. Mr. Green stated that some of the changes were for continuity purposes and that there is no intent to change the substance of what they discussed.

The Commission briefly discussed the changes to the New Construction Guidelines.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the revision to the Standards of New Construction Guidelines as presented and amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 5-0-0.

Secretary Report

Mr. Hill stated that they have gotten as far in the recruitment process as to have some applications in hand for the CAR Secretary position and that they are looking to get in touch with the applicants and set up interviews in the next two or three weeks. Mr. Hill stated that in October Mr. Sanford Bond will be reappointed to a full term. Mr. Hill stated that they will also be introducing Ms. Rebecca Sydnor as a VHC nominee for appointment and that she was formerly with Baskerville and is now with Sustainable Design. They anticipate her appointment being introduced at the first City Council meeting in October and have Ms. Sydnor appointed at the second meeting. Mr. Hill stated that Ms. Sydnor could join the Commission at the October meeting.

Enforcement

Mr. Palmquist stated that they issued a Notice of Violation in the 800 block of Jessamine Street for replacement siding with cement board siding and that they will be receiving an application for that change. Ms. Palmquist stated that they issued a NOV in the 200 block of N. 32nd Street for a shed installation in which for which they haven't received an application and that they issued a NOV in the 2300 block of Venable Street and at a property in the 900 block of N. 24th Street for replacement windows. They also issued an NOV for a property in the 2300 block of Venable Street for a heat pump in the front yard that they received an application for that work shortly after. Mr. Palmquist stated that they will be

following up on a complaint for a property in the 800 block of Mosby Street for the installation of windows and modifications of window openings.

Mr. Hill stated that he will be in court on October 18th for the Houghton window case.

UDC REPORT

Mr. Green stated that at the last UDC meeting there were four approvals which included a series of neighborhood sign encroachments on Belmont Avenue which was a consent agenda item. Mr. Green stated that on the regular agenda there were 3 items reviewed. One was for a new roundabout on Idlewood and Grayland and I-195 coming off the highway into Oregon Hill. Mr. Green stated that they are going to recreate two-way traffic on Idlewood Avenue and that it passed on to the Planning Commission and was approved with conditions. Mr. Green stated that the next project was the traffic calming of Floyd Avenue and Laurel Street and that there was a series of recommendations. The Commission recommended to split the review and more or less approve everything in the west side of Floyd Avenue. For the east side, they asked for a closer look at the way the traffic circles are being handled and their impact on parking. That was forwarded to the Planning Commission with those recommendations. Mr. Green stated that the final project was for a new Carytown Gateway sign which was proposed at the off-ramp of I-195 onto Thompson Street which was denied and then withdrawn from the Planning Commission agenda.

Other Business

Mr. Green stated that there is a plan for improvements at the Lee circle roundabout and that this came in late but they have a couple of different ways they can comment on it. Mr. Green stated that they can comment on it as a Commission and pass a resolution or they could schedule a special meeting at a later date or they can forward their comments to Mr. Green and he will take them to the UDC meeting on the 9th of October. Mr. Green stated that they will have a chance to discuss this at the quarterly meeting.

Mr. Hill stated that this project came to them very recently and that Public Works has been working on this with some of the residents of Monument Avenue and the Monument Avenue Preservation Society for quite some time. Mr. Hill stated that they want to look at modifications for safety and pedestrians at the Lee Circle. Mr. Hill stated that they are planning to take it for final review and approval to the UDC and the Planning Commission. Mr. Hill stated that this is a project that is in the public right-of-way so it is not covered under a Certificate of Appropriateness which is through the zoning ordinance which would apply generally to private property. Mr. Hill stated that one of the Commission's duties in the City Code is to advise the city on the handling of its historic resources and stated as this is an Old and Historic District, National Register District, Virginia Landmark District and a Historical Landmark, it's appropriate that the

Commission provide their comments to the UDC. Mr. Hill gave a description of the project and changes and stated that they are supposed to be getting some more detailed information that will be available to the Commission.

Mr. Green reiterated that they can call a special meeting, discuss at the quarterly meeting or email their comments.

Mr. Bond stated that he will be happy to send in comments to the Chair and have him come up with a recommendation.

Mr. Yates commented that this is not something new and stated that it has been going on for 10 or 12 years and that he would prefer to see the old arrangement remain intact. Mr. Yates stated that it is really one of health and safety for both vehicles and pedestrians and that the Lee circle is state property and there is no alterations to the statue or the circle itself. Mr. Yates stated that it is extremely difficult and on occasion life threatening to try and traverse Monument Avenue in any of these areas. Mr. Yates stated that cars tend to end up in peoples' yards and that the reason for the little bump-outs is to prevent people from using the third lane which people often do.

Mr. Green stated that if the Commission sends their comments to him he will write up a resolution and they could vote on it at the quarterly meeting.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if the grass was going to extend and Mr. Hill stated, yes and that the plan was for the existing curb to read as grass on the same level and that they suggested just pavement markings in the cross lanes. Mr. Hendricks inquired if there was discussion about making any cathead areas out of cobblestones or some other material that would maintain the integrity of the median to differentiate the look. Mr. Hill stated that he would imagine that was discussed during the last 10 or 12 years and stated that would be one alternate treatment to consider.

Mr. Bilder inquired about the black dots on the plans and Mr. Hill stated that they are signs and that this will result in a reduction of signs but there will be four Chevron signs to encourage people not to drive up into the circle and continue around it.

Mr. Hill stated that one thing that came up was whether or not they should make accommodations for pedestrian crossing into the circle and stated that staff was opposed to that.

The Commission came up with the consensus to send to Mr. Hill their comments.

Mr. Green stated that he wants the Commission to review CAR policies and guidelines and see if they need to be updated and inquired if anyone would like to volunteer to read through them.

Mr. Hill stated that the City Administration is asking all departments to go through and make sure that the policies are up to date.

Nr. Elmes inquired if the check list is still being handed out with the application and Mr. Hill stated that they don't do the checklist, instead they have the submission guidelines.

Mr. Green and Mr. Elmes stated that they will take a look at the policies.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Yates introduce a motion to move item #6 for 2018 W. Grace Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda and item #12 for 2611 E. Broad Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-0-0.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

Application No. 14-102 (No House left behind LLC)

2314 Venable 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. 14-102 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 front concrete walkway with stamped concrete, 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: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-097 (J. King & B. Isenberg)

2018 West Grace 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. 14-097 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 rear cinder block wall and install wooden fence and 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: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-104 (Homeowners Assn. Inc.)

2611 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.14-104 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. Elmes seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace existing wooden fence with brick wall, 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: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 14-093 (K. and J. Brooks)

2104-2106 Cedar Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct a new duplex in Union Hill Old and Historic District. Mr. Hill gave an overall review of the siting, form, scale, height, width and proportion, massing, materials, colors and details. Staff recommends that the owner consider building covered stoops with side stairs, a convention found nearby in the district, rather than building that stair configuration under a full-width porch roof. Staff recommends that the applicant submit colors drawn from the approved palette to CAR staff for administrative review and approval. The applicant recently installed windows with grid-between-glass muntins, indicated as inappropriate. Staff recommend the use of double-hung wood sash or aluminum-clad wood sash with true or simulated-divided lites. Staff recommends approval of the application provided that the applicant confirm the requested information for delegation to staff for administrative review and approval.

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

Mr. Keith Brooks came up to answer questions.

Mr. Yates inquired where the property line on the front of the property are. Mr. Brooks stated that there is only about 5' between the sidewalks to the next to the property line and stated that there is very limited space around the entire home and that there is about a 1' difference between the property line and the neighbor's property line.

Mr. Elmes inquired for clarification if these are the previous plans before they purchased the property and Mr. Brooks stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if they knew that the windows were not a part of the original permit and Mr. Brooks stated that they knew that the window design had already been cut in there but states no he didn't. Mr. Elmes stated that the permit states that it is for interior work only and that the applicant must return to CAR for final approval of exterior work including windows, siding and porches. Mr. Elmes stated that the applicant knew the windows weren't a part of the application and Mr. Brooks stated that he knew it wasn't a part of the application, however the windows were already available upon the purchase of the property and stated that he shared with Mr. Hill that he came down to speak to Ms. Easterling and assumed that everything was taken care of. Mr. Brooks stated that he talked to Mr. Hill after the violation that he shouldn't have put those windows in. Elmes stated that it looks to be room there for a landing and Mr. Brooks stated that it would be acceptable to do it like the other porches.

Mr. Bilder inquired if they are using vinyl siding and what the current siding is there now. Mr. Brooks stated that it is HardiPlank and it will be all the way

around.

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

Mr. Green stated that on the photos it looks like the stairs are inset in the porch and that it would fit the current situation.

Mr. Bilder inquired if the permit was pulled after the historic designation and Mr. Hill stated that the great changes to the historic building were done on a permit was pulled in 2008 and the district was designated in 2009. He stated that the historic building disappeared before it was designated. Mr. Hill stated that the permit was expired and killed and the current owner pulled a new permit.

Mr. Yates inquired that if they were to approve a smaller porch or stoop at either door would staff feel comfortable if that design be delegated to staff. Mr. Hill stated that even if they needed to return just for the stoop and they were excluded from the current permit they could proceed with majority of the work and that if the design is straight forward and convincing, so that they feel comfortable doing that, they could approve it on the Commission's authority.

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application based on the staff report with the condition that the owner return to staff with a stoop design and that it meets code and is acceptable to staff and that the windows be replaced with wood or aluminum-clad wood window with a 2-over-2 configuration because that seems to be what is prevalent on the street and that the doors be replaced with a design that can be deferred to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new duplex,
and
WHEREAS, that the applicant provide a design of the front
stoops which meets codes and can be approved by staff,
and
WHEREAS, the windows be replace the vinyl windows with
wood or aluminum-clad wood windows with a 2-over-2 grid
pattern with true or simulated-divided lites, and
WHEREAS, the applicant replace the front doors with a door
that is more compatible with the district which can be
approved by staff, and
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the
Commission approves the work as being in conformity with
the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City
Code.

Application No. 14-094 (B. Traylor)

868 Jessamine Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace a non-historic front porch, construct a new rear addition, and install a rear privacy fence at this property located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicant is also seeking historic tax credits. Staff recommends that any changes required by the National Park Service or the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for tax credit purposes be deferred to Commission staff for final review. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

Mr. Green inquired if the applicant's intent with the porch roof is to retain the existing fiber and Mr. Palmquist stated that he is not sure but states that the roof and ceiling will remain. Mr. Green inquired about the intent for the second floor windows and Mr. Palmquist stated that they are going to be repaired in place. Mr. Green inquired about the rear windows and Mr. Palmquist stated that he doesn't have anything about the windows being replaced and stated that they are proposing a new window on the new rear addition.

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

Mr. Bryan Traylor came up to answer questions.

Mr. Green inquired what the intent is with front porch roof and Mr. Traylor stated that they will keep it and that it is a repair and replace situation. He stated that they are going to go back with what they can salvage and build it back to what it was. Mr. Green inquired about the intent with the second floor windows and Mr. Traylor stated that those little pieces of plywood are just tacked in there and they are going to remove those and will rework each window and leave all the original sashes there. Mr. Green inquired about the configuration of the existing rear window and Mr. Traylor stated that they are 2-over-2 originals and that if they have to go back they have some old 2-over-2 sashes so that everything will be old and historic.

Mr. Yates inquired if the columns on the front porch are original and Mr. Traylor stated that there is a third column in the house holding up some duct work and stated that they match the two that are on the right hand side. Mr. Yates asked if they are repairing the upper cornices on the front of the house and Mr. Traylor stated yes.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they were going to get one more column and Mr. Traylor stated that they are going to try to get them all matched up or get something very similar or get them made up. Mr. Traylor stated that with the windows on the second floor they may have to fill them in with vinyl siding.

Mr. Elmes stated that it looks like they just filled them in because the storm was too short and Mr. Traylor stated yes and that they will remove those.

Mr. Yates inquired if they will bring vinyl siding down and Mr. Traylor stated yes.

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

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the staff recommendations and with the additional clarification that the porch roof and cornice will be repaired to its original configuration as much as possible and the second story windows will be returned to their full height with the repairs to the cornices and that the columns to the right will be used for the basis for four columns and if the 8-over-8 windows are intact to repair and reuse. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace front porch and construct new rear addition, and
WHEREAS, the front porch roof and cornice be repaired to the original condition, and
WHEREAS, the front 2nd floor windows be restored to their full height, and
WHEREAS, the rear 2nd story windows be retained and repaired, and
WHEREAS, the roof cornice be repaired to its original condition, and
WHEREAS, the three original front porch columns be repaired and used to reproduce the missing fourth column,
WHEREAS, the review and approval of any changes required by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service for rehabilitation tax credit purposes is deferred to staff, and
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks and Yates
Negative: None
Abstain: None

Application No. 14-095 (Evolve Acquisitions LLC)

611-613 N 21st Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct two attached duplexes at two vacant lots locating in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The proposed two-story building has a shed roof that replicates the Italianate building style found throughout the district. Staff went over the standards for new construction and recommends that staff would rather see the primary façade of the proposed structure align more with the buildings to the north and south. Staff also recommends the use of wood or aluminum-clad wood windows with true or simulated divided lites in place of the proposed vinyl windows. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Daniil Kleyman distributed some new plans that shows the front setback now aligns with the other houses. Mr. Kleyman stated that the windows are MW 300 windows which are the same windows that CAR has approved previously.

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

Mr. Yates inquired if staff has some photos that shows the whole front of either 615 to the left or 607 to the right and Mr. Palmquist stated that he doesn't think it was included in the presentation. Mr. Yates stated that based on the drawings, it shows 607 and 616 as being identical and stated that 607 is considerably lower than 616 by at least 4'. Mr. Yates stated that he understands where the applicant is going with this by trying to approximate the floor levels and stated that they have reduced height of the building so that it aligns with 615. Mr. Yates stated that the fact is the 2 house are drawn incorrectly and scues his view of the elevation and stated that he has an issue with the height and not with the design and facade.

Mr. Bilder stated that with the grade of the street they're not all uniformed.

Mr. Elmes stated that at 31' it looks like the house to the north.

Mr. Kleyman stated that there was a massive drop in elevation between the front and the back of the lot and that he is confident that his architect measured the house at 607.

Mr. Green stated that the number of steps on both buildings is incorrect and that the concern is that the building they are proposing is very tall and there is a lot of space between the top of the windows and the cornice. Mr. Kleyman stated that the difference between the window and cornice line is due to the design of the roof from front to back.

Mr. Kleyman state that he knows the measurements are correct but is not sure if they went by the steps. Mr. Green stated that if the height is accurate it's not accounting for the site slope in the street.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the new site plan showing that the mean setback to the front of the house is now 10' and requesting that the applicant double check his field dimensions to make sure that the height of the building will align with the building to the north, which is 615. Mr. Yates made a friendly amendment that they review it with staff. Mr. Elmes added that they will defer the final measurement confirmation to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Mr. Hill inquired if it will be sufficient if the field measurements shows that the relative heights of the two buildings if the new building is 1'-4" taller than 615 is acceptable. Mr. Elmes stated that on the revised elevation it shows that it is the same.

After further discussion the motion passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct two attached duplexes, and
WHEREAS, the new site plan showing a 10' setback, and
WHEREAS, the applicant verify the heights of the buildings drawn in the streetscape profile, and
WHEREAS, the final approval of which is deferred to staff as long as the proposed building is similar in height to 615 N. 21st Street.
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, Hughes and Yates
Negative: None
Abstain: None

Application No. 14-096 (Evolve Acquisition LLC)

807 N. 23rd Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new duplex on a vacant lot located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The proposed building is a two-story structure with a shed roof that replicates the Italianate building styles found throughout the district. Staff discussed the standards for new construction and recommends that the applicant use wood or aluminum-clad wood windows with true or simulated divided lites in place of the proposed vinyl windows. The proposed infill project appears generally to be in keeping with the Standards of New Construction and recommends approval of the project with a condition.

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

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

Mr. Yates thanked Mr. Kleyman and the architect for showing all of the dimensions.

Mr. Elmes stated that in looking at 805 and 805 ½ as far as the porch details go the side legs on the porch is over hanging where it passing the edge of the building and inquired if that was the intention or is it design to be the same as 21st St property. Mr. Traylor stated that the design is correct and the porch is not quite as wide as the building itself. Mr. Elmes stated that at 805 and 805 ½ the porch is projecting pass the edge of the building. Mr. Elmes commented that he meant to ask if the cornice of the roof is going to extend and Mr. Traylor stated no.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the staff comments and with the clarification that the porch roof will not extend beyond the side of the building. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new duplex,
and
WHEREAS, the clarification that the front porch roof will not
extend past the sides of the main structure, 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.

Application No. 14-098 (St. John's Church)

2401 E. Broad Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to remove existing Hendricks Tile from the roof of the church and the existing painted standing-seam metal roof of the parish hall at this property in the eponymous St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The replacement will involve removing standing-seam metal painted to look like patinated copper and the installation of standing-seam copper. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

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

Ms. Amy Swartz with St. John's Church Foundation and Mr. Paul Saunders with Saunders Roofing came up to answer questions.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the steel structural system that they put on with the Hendricks tile is not working correctly. Ms. Swartz stated that the structural engineer is looking at that now and that he said it is failing in some spots due to the weight of the Hendricks tile. Mr. Elmes stated that he was wondering about the steel structural system and inquired if it is under the Hendricks tile and Ms. Swartz stated yes and that the engineers are looking at the tile rods that are visible at the ceiling inside the church so those they hope can be removed and that they are going to look at the structure as well and they will be happy to share that report when they get it. Mr. Elmes inquired if it will change the outside view of the cornice and Ms. Swartz stated no. Mr. Elmes inquired if they are going to use a mechanized roller. Mr. Saunders stated that they are going to use sealing mechanical tool.

Mr. Bond stated that this was a second priority for the church to get done because the structure has continued to settle because of the weight.

Mr. Yates stated that it is his understanding that every since the steel company went out of business that you really can't obtain a true turned metal roof anymore and Mr. Saunders stated yes. Mr. Yates stated that the only places you can go to is these prefinished very mechanical looking material and the only other option is true copper. Mr. Saunders stated that stainless steel is an option.

Mr. Elmes stated that unfinished galvanized metal is also an option.

Mr. Bilder inquired how the demolition was going to be handled and Mr. Saunders stated that they take off what they can cover in a day and do it in sections. Mr. Bilder asked if they were doing a new gutter and Mr. Saunders stated yes. Mr. Bilder inquired what was there now and Mr. Saunders stated that it is an external gutter.

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

Mr. Green stated that while Commonwealth Architects did the report, but they did

it before he worked at the firm and stated that he is not recusing himself from the project.

Mr. Yates stated that he never understood why the Hendricks tiles were put on this building to begin with and that it's not the historical appropriate building material and that this is an excellent way to help preserve the church.

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

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to rehabilitate roof of church and parish hall, and
 WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
 NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

*Mr. Bond left at 5:29 p.m.

Application No. 14-099 (Arcadia Condo Assoc.)

407 N. Allen Avenue

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to paint the brick portions of a Mediterranean-style multi-family residence in the Monument Avenue Old and Historic District. Mr. Hill stated that they received some e-mails and calls this morning letting staff know that the building was painted on Monday. Mr. Hill stated that they had some Commission members that did site visits on Sunday and depicted what was shown in the photos. Mr. Hill stated that they have some photos that were taken today as the house appears now. Mr. Hill stated that staff has worked with some members of the Condo Association on this application and looked at the colors they submitted for the stucco body of the house and the trim and stated that staff didn't feel comfortable administratively approving paint colors for portions of the building that have exposed brick. Mr. Hill stated that the issue is not clear cut and that the *Guidelines* states that unpainted masonry should not be painted.

Mr. Hill stated that the building is in a Mediterranean revival-style and the finish that was chosen for the exterior work was intentionally selected to convey a weathered appearance or a mottled patina of age and that he believes the same was true of the unpainted brick portion. Mr. Hill stated that you can see that there were a couple of different treatments within the door arch and the steep set windows next to the entrance. He stated that there was more paint covering these elements where they were somewhat protected from the elements. Mr. Hill stated that staff felt that using paint and giving a monochromatic appearance meant that this property would lose what was a very intentional design characteristic. Mr. Hill stated that they did have problems with the downspout and some moss was growing on the brick below it.

Mr. Hill stated that Mr. Palmquist took photos today of the current condition of the building which show that the patina character and the layering have been smoothed over, and the brick areas have been painted and there is far less distinction between the different portions of the building. Mr. Hill stated that because of the concerns about the loss of the character-defining features and intentional design element, staff has recommended denial of the project with the monochromatic painting of these portions of the building with previously unpainted brick. Mr. Hill stated that they are advising an alternate treatment to replicate that appearance for the entire brick portion, or the areas where they had to do repairs or maintenance.

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

Mr. John Moon on behalf of Arcadia stated that some of things that he wants to point out that the "before" pictures were taken before Sunday. Mr. Hill stated that they were taken in the last 20 or 25 days.

Mr. Green stated that some of the Commission members visited the site on Sunday.

Mr. Moon stated that some of it was already rubbed off and they treated the brick and they took some of the mold, mildew and moss off and a lot of the paint that was originally there came off so that is why it seems that there is more exposed brick there now.

Mr. Green inquired where the exposed brick was and Mr. Moon stated that a lot of the paint came off when they were cleaning it and that it was whiter than it is now. A lot of the paint got chipped off and a lot of the mortaring got fixed. Mr. Moon stated that in his application he noted that in April a tree fell on the property on the corner brick which had to have some masonry work done and that they had some new bricks installed so it doesn't look like the existing brick. Mr. Moon stated that white washing is really a technique that is lime and water that will fade over time, and that it is recommended that they do it every year. Mr. Green stated that is not a professional recommendation that he has been aware of and stated that he does this for a living and that he believes that is an incorrect statement. Mr. Moon stated that the paint on there was not applied correctly, that it was old paint, and that there were probably about three shades of paint on there: blue, gray and white. Mr. Moon stated that he doesn't believe it was intentionally supposed to have that whitewash look.

Mr. Green stated that there are photographs that show this mottled appearance in place on that building for a very long time and that it is a very common technique on Mediterranean Revival-styled buildings built in that period. Mr. Moon inquired how they accomplish that finish and Mr. Green stated that there are many different ways and that it is not a symptom of wear, but an intentional design choice. Mr. Moon inquired if it is done with paint and Mr. Green stated that it can be done with paint and lime wash and that there are multiple ways to get the same appearance. Mr. Moon stated that the brick has been exposed and there are issues with the brick leaking and the mortaring needed to be re-fixed which again took away from the weathered look. Mr. Moon stated that they also sent an e-mail to the residents in the area explaining exactly what was going to happen and didn't receive any objections to the proposed work. He has that email if the members wanted to see it.

Mr. Hill inquired if it was their misunderstanding that sending the email to neighbors was the same as taking it to the Commission. Ms. Moon stated no, and that they were notifying the neighbors if they wanted to come to them and talk about the work before they came to the Commission.

Mr. Green inquired if they were aware that they had an appointment to be on the agenda today and Mr. Moon stated yes, and that you can see where they stopped because he wasn't there and they weren't supposed to paint the whitewashed brick. He stated that he doesn't know where the disconnect was, but that one of the residents was there and did tell them to stop after they realized that the brick had been painted. Mr. Moon stated that it wasn't their

intention to go ahead and do it before they came and got approval from the Commission, that there was a miscommunication, and that they were only supposed to paint the house and not the unpainted brick portion. Mr. Moon stated that any brick that wasn't previously painted isn't going to get painted, it's just the whitewashed. He stated that it is not going to be the actual color of the house, but that it is just the primer right now.

Mr. Bilder inquired if the other members of the Condo Association agree to the painting and Mr. Moon stated, yes.

Mr. Green asked if they were aware that they didn't have a Certificate of Appropriateness to paint the brick portions and Mr. Moon stated yes, and that when they realized it was being painted, one of the neighbors immediately came out there and told them to stop. Mr. Green inquired if they communicated with the painter that they have not received a Certificate of Appropriateness for any painting and Mr. Moon stated that they did receive an Administrative approval for the building.

Ms. Carolyn McCormack stated that she owns the first floor unit and stated that a lot of damage was done to this unit because of a tree falling on it and that the residence has gone through great expense to repair the building to its original condition. Ms. McCormack stated that they replaced the terra cotta tiles, put in copper gutters and repaired the stucco and that there was a lot of damage done to the stucco during the tree episode. Ms. McCormack stated that with the colors they tried to be very in line with the Historical Association in selecting the new colors and that this was a primer coat. She went on to state that they were not painting the whole building a muted one toned. Ms. McCormack stated that they all really like this building, that they really want to maintain the historical value of the building, and that they were not trying to overstep anybody's authority.

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

Mr. Yates inquired of the administrative approval given for the stucco and Mr. Hill stated yes, that the paint colors were administratively approved for the main portion of the building. Mr. Yates stated that he has lived in this neighborhood since 2000 and that the building has looked pretty much the same until Sunday night or Monday morning. Mr. Yates stated that as Mr. Green has pointed out, distressing the brick is a very typical Colonial revival treatment that you see on houses all over town. Mr. Yates stated that the paint on the stucco has worn but that it appears that the last important color was gray. Mr. Yates stated that the painting of the brick was completely inappropriate and that he hopes that the Condo Association will go back to the painter and see if he can correct what he has done.

Mr. Bilder stated that the entire character of the building has been changed and that the stucco was an essential element of the building. Mr. Bilder stated that it was significant to the building, that he is glad that they want to protect the structure by making it safe and clean, but that this building is unique and that what was done has completely altered the character of the building.

Mr. Green inquired what will be the chances of getting that paint off and Mr. Elmes stated that it should come off.

Mr. Green stated that when he looked at the property Sunday that his recommendation would have been to leave the paint alone and suggest some ways to infill the areas where the damage was. Mr. Green stated that he had less concern over the southern projecting bay because it looked to him as though it might have been a later infill and that he would have been prepared to allow them to paint that bay. Mr. Green stated that they could ask them to remove the paint on the previous whitewashed portion that had not been painted on the brick. Mr. Green inquired if the primer had been on there briefly enough and if there is some way to get it off.

Mr. Elmes stated that the particular primer is designed specifically to work on a variety of substrates and it is very sticky but that being said, it hasn't been fully cured and will be fairly easy to remove with a mild lye-based chemical. Mr. Elmes stated that you wouldn't want to try and use a pressure wash or something like that because then you are further damage the mortar joints and the masonry. Mr. Elmes stated that speaking to the waterproofing concerns, there are a wide variety of water proofers that are approved for use. Mr. Elmes stated that having gone through tax credit projects himself, there are very good waterproofings that aren't solid paint films and actually work better than paint films.

Mr. Hendricks made a motion to deny the application for the reasons cited in the staff report. Mr. Hendricks inquired if they need to make a recommendation that they remove the paint that had been applied and restore the finish.

Mr. Green asked Mr. Hill about the procedures for the denial. Mr. Hill stated that it was beyond staff's ability to tell them what the process was for recreating this finish and that bringing it before the Commission there would be someone present that would know where to go for those resources. Mr. Hill stated that unless this is approved today they are in violation because they changed the appearance without the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Hill stated that it would be helpful to advise them on the recommended next steps which would appear to be to remove the primer from those areas and that they are not trying to get it back to a pristine, uniform surface because of the [prior] variation in the appearance. Mr. Hill stated that typically when something like this happens, if it is approved then they're not in violation, and if it was denied they [staff] would give them [applicants] the opportunity to address the violation and stated that giving them the means to adequately address that would be helpful to staff.

Mr. Green inquired if the motion gives adequate direction for mediation. Mr. Hill stated that staff recommended denial of the project and recommended that the alternate treatment be supplied and be available to the applicant.

Mr. Elmes stated that [National Park Service] Preservation Briefs speak to it.

Mr. Yates stated that in this situation he doesn't believe that it is necessary for them to recommend a remedial type of treatment other than that they return the wall to its condition prior to the most recent painting. Mr. Yates stated that the Commission will assist Commission staff, and that staff will assist the owners in reaching that appearance.

Mr. Elmes stated that there is a scope concern as well.

Mr. Green made an amendment that they allow the paint to remain on the south bay and stated that he thinks the south bay has been repaired overtime and that he would rather see the attention be focused on the front and north side.

Mr. Elmes stated that this project has come to the Commission before because they approved the portico roof on the south bay and part of the talk was that the south bay had been added or modified and that at one time it was an open porch. Mr. Elmes stated that the windows were open and so the infill brick on that section wasn't original to the façade structure to begin with and that Mr. Green's suggestion is a perfectly valid one and agreed that he would like to try to focus their attention on what's already a difficult situation on the primary façade of the structure. Mr. Hendricks accepted the amendment.

After further discussion Mr. Yates seconded the motion and passed 5-0-0.

Mr. Hendricks reread the motion to deny the application for the reasons cited in the staff report requesting that the owner return the brick finish back to the pre-painted condition with the exception for the south bay which can remain painted.

Application No. 14-100 (A. & L. Holloway)

2406 Venable Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report for the applicant's request for the rehabilitation of a two-story residence in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The applicant proposes the repair of salvageable siding and the replacement of deteriorated siding with matching wood clapboards. The applicant also proposes to replace the existing porch columns with new wood columns that match the profile of the engaged columns found at 2404 Venable Street. Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that all windows replacement or repair results in the installation of wood or aluminum clad wood with true or simulated divided lites, provided that the applicant can demonstrate the rear windows are beyond the point of repair.

Mr. Green opened the floor for applicant and public comment

Ms. Sarah Cox stated they have consulted with the replacement of the windows and that all of the windows will be wood windows with simulated-divided lites and that the front windows muntins will be replaced and the windows will be re-glazed. Ms. Cox stated that they have reconfigured the side windows with simulated-divided lites and stated that one of the windows in the back was totally missing and the other one was completely damaged. Ms. Cox stated that shortly after purchase they learned that the building was structurally un-sound and when they went to reinforce the structure the back wall and windows upstairs collapsed and that they will use simulated-divided lites.

Mr. Yates inquired what the muntin patterns are in the large window in the front door and Ms. Cox stated that they are 6-over-6. Mr. Yates inquired about the rear windows and Ms. Cox stated will also be 6-over-6.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the whole house was gutted inside and Ms. Cox stated no.

Mr. Elmes commented that the window seems small for the size of the facade and inquired if there was any evidence that they had been shrunk and Ms. Cox stated that there was no evidence of it.

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

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application based on the staff recommendations and conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 5-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace siding, repair windows, replace windows, restore porch columns, and
 WHEREAS, that any window that cannot be retained and repaired be replaced with a 6-over-6 wood windows with simulated-divided lites, and

WHEREAS, the review and approval of any changes required by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service for rehabilitation tax credit purposes is deferred to staff, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hughes and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-101 (D. Seibert)

2305 Venable Street

Mr. Hill presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for the rehabilitation of a two-story residence in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The building is in poor condition and many of the architectural features are missing or deteriorated. The applicant proposes to rehabilitate the front porch by retaining and repairing the existing turned posts and replicating the existing rail where it is missing. Staff requests that the Commission allow staff to work with the applicant as permit documents are developed and missing information is provided or the applicant return to the Commission with additional information. Staff is recommending approval of the project.

Mr. Green inquired if there was any reason why the applicant didn't submit any drawings. Mr. Hill stated no and stated that they saw a description and it was very detailed. Mr. Green stated that he is uncomfortable with making a decision without drawings. Mr. Hill stated that even if that is the case there are some things can be permitted in a way of stabilization and some work that would allow them to get started.

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

Mr. Bryan Townes stated the reason why there is no drawings is that except for the windows and new doors, everything will be repaired and replaced in-kind. Mr. Townes stated that they are not redesigning the front porch, eaves or the cornices and that they will be repaired and maintained. Mr. Townes stated that the only issue they will have on the new construction is on the rear south elevation where it would be a plan box eave with an internal ogee gutter. Mr. Townes stated the he has cut sheet for the windows which are Geld-Win clad window for the rear 1-over-1 window.

Mr. Yates inquired about the design of the new front door and Mr. Townes stated that the front door is going to be maintained and if it is repairable it will be kept as is and that it will just be a plain modern no-paneled door. Mr. Yates inquired if they planned on repeating the treatment of the balusters. Mr. Townes stated that they are going to repair the two railings that are there and if the height of the porch does require a railing then they will replicate that between the two front porch columns.

Mr. Elmes inquired if they cut the bottom of the posts off when they re-did the porch and stated that it seems like it is hitting in the wrong spot. Mr. Elmes inquired if the porch decking is being replaced and Mr. Townes stated yes, with tongue and groove.

Mr. Townes stated that he made an error in the description of the door and stated that the rear doors there will be one 6-panel steel door proposed and the second floor door will be fixed in place and it will be a metal door with glass lite in the top portion and 2-panels below.

There were no additional public comment. Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green stated that he thinks this a great project and he doesn't have an issue what with they are striving for. He stated that his only issue is not having the drawings and that his preference would be to put forth a motion that would allow them to do the stabilization work to get them going and ask them to come back with the configuration of the deck and parking with in the rear.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the conditions noted in the staff report and for the applicant to get administrative approval from staff for the construction of the new deck in rear and the rehabilitation of the front porch and the materials to be used in the new parking area.

Mr. Green inquired if staff was comfortable with the motion. Mr. Hill stated that they might ask for additional information that would go into the file.

Mr. Hendricks stated that there is nothing in the report about the roof and Mr. Elmes stated no.

Mr. Green asked the applicant if the decorative slate will remain and Mr. Townes stated yes, that it will be repaired and that currently the front porch roof has asphalt shingles so they are proposing going with a membrane roof colored to match the trim or a dark color.

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 5-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to rehabilitate front porch, construct new deck, repair windows, install new window sashes, construct new parking area and privacy fence, and
WHEREAS, the applicant provide staff with drawings of the proposed rear deck and parking area and for the reconstructed front porch, and
WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and
NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Commission approves the work as being in conformity with the intent of Division 4 Section 114-930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, and Yates
Negative: None
Abstain: None

Application No. 14-103 (Ridge Point Real Estate)

718-720 N. 27th Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to construct a new single-family house on two vacant lot located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The proposed building is a two-story building with a shed roof that replicates the Italianate buildings style found throughout the district. Commission staff reviewed the project through the lens of the Standards of New constructions. Staff recommends the use of wood or aluminum-clad windows with true or simulated divided lites. Staff also recommends the installation of black metal porch roofs instead of architectural shingles. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

Mr. Green inquired if the applicant added details for the columns other than wood and Mr. Palmquist stated that he is not sure.

Mr. Elmes stated that the application stated that they will be a brick veneer.

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

Mr. Chris Jefferson stated that the piers will be brick and veneer and the foundation will be brick and the porch columns will be wood and stated that it could be left up to the staff to approve it.

Mr. Green inquired what kind of columns and Mr. Jefferson stated that it will be a turned column or something compatible with the historic district.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that they are talking about using TPO on the porch roofs and Mr. Jefferson stated yes, and that it will be black.

Mr. Yates inquired about the material for the window and Mr. Jefferson stated that he hasn't picked a specific window and asked if he can do the aluminum clad window but if he can use the MW Jefferson 300 double hung.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if they are using clear glass on the front door and Mr. Jefferson stated yes.

Mr. Yates inquired if they have approved PVC clad windows before and Mr. Palmquist stated yes in the past and on 2 earlier applications.

Mr. Yates stated that the first-floor windows in the front appear to be a little short and stated that he think it would improve if portions of the house at the head of the first floor windows align with the head of the door and stated that he would be okay with it if they extend it to the head height of the door.

Mr. Elmes stated that this is an echoing of previous Commissioner's concern and his concern as a resident in the Churchill area and feels that they are creating a recurring theme architecturally which could be argued a little and be considered a false historicism. Mr. Elmes stated that there are multiple architectural styles that

could be found throughout the district and that they seem to be getting applications that repeat and repeat. He stated this could be any of the same applications that they have seen in the last two meetings. Mr. Elmes stated that he is reaching the saturation point on approving the same thing time and time again and for the reasons that are stated in the Guidelines which is the creation of false historicism. Mr. Elmes stated that the application is great and the house looks like a ton of other houses that they have approved and that he doesn't think the intent of the Guidelines was to have a district with houses that all look the same.

Mr. Hendricks stated that it will be interesting to see a map of all of the house that they approved.

Mr. Green stated that this is something that they could address at the quarterly meeting.

Mr. Elmes stated that there are a wide variety of architectural styles available.

Mr. Bilder stated that this design was affordable and utilitarian and that he thinks it should be a departure of Italianate architectural houses.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application as presented with the comments provided by staff with the following conditions: that the columns be turned and that the applicant bring the column details to staff, that the applicant use a black TPO on the porch roof and that the windows be either aluminum clad or the Jefferson Series and bring those cut sheets to staff for review and approval and that the first floor windows align with the height of the transom.

Mr. Jefferson stated that he has a question about the rear roof and asked can he use grand mere shingles on the rear as far as asphalt versus a second TPO roof.

Mr. Yates inquired why they want to have the architectural shingles on the rear instead of the front porch. Mr. Jefferson stated that in his opinion a metal roof looks better from the front of the house.

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 5-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new single-family house, and
 WHEREAS, the applicant provide the turned column design to staff for their review and approval, and
 WHEREAS, the front and rear porch roofs will be black TPO, and
 WHEREAS, the applicant provide the window selection to staff for their review and approval which can be either aluminum-clad or MW 300-series PVC-clad windows, and

WHEREAS, the front first-story windows align with the height of the transoms, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-106 (Z. Kennedy)

2912-2912 ½ E. Leigh Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized 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. The proposed single-family dwelling is a two-story building with a shed roof that replicates the Italianate building style found throughout the district. Mr. Palmquist discussed the standards for new construction and recommends that the Commission defer final review and approval of color selections to staff. The front porch and rear deck should be painted or stained a neutral color that complements the overall color scheme of the house. Staff also recommends that the applicant install wood or aluminum-clad wood with true or simulated divided lites. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Zach Kennedy stated that they have chosen a paint color and inquired if they could use wood grain and Mr. Elmes stated no. Mr. Kennedy stated that he chose Pacifica blue for the color.

Mr. Yates stated that on the original design shows a small hip roof portion of the rear and now it is extending across the back on the rear of the house and Mr. Kennedy stated yes, that the deck is bigger than it was at first. Mr. Kennedy stated that the windows will be realigned on the side. Mr. Yates inquired about the front porch columns and Mr. Kennedy stated that it will be a 4 or 5 inch spindle wood. Mr. Yates commented that the head of the first floor window will align with the head of the transoms on the door and Mr. Kennedy stated that they will align right over top of each other.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that the request for the wood grain siding is clearly against the guidelines.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented and for the reasons cited in the staff report and with the revisions made in the application. Mr. Elmes stated that the siding be smooth and defer the colors to staff or the color presented which was Pacifica blue. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 5-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct new single-family house, and
 WHEREAS, the cement board siding be smooth and untextured, and
 WHEREAS, the cement board be "Pacifica Blue," or another

color which can be approved by staff, and

WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

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

VOTE: Affirmative: Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hendricks and Yates
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 14-105 (S. Hodges)

2241 W. Grace Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request to replace all five windows at the front of this structure within the West Grace Street Old and Historic District. The applicant requests approval to use a six-over-one grid pattern for these front replacement windows in place of the one-over-one grid pattern previously approved, in order to match the other six-over-one windows found at the sides and rear of the house. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

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

Mr. Green stated that he wishes the applicant was here and that the 6-over-1 is noted in the staff report as a form that is simply not found in the neighborhood and that there isn't any precedent that would support it.

Mr. Yates stated that their firm did some interior work on this house and do not recall a 6-over-1 pattern on the front window.

Mr. Green made a motion to deny the application for the reasons stated that in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 5-0-0.

Mr. Elmes stated that on the application number 6 or 12, that neither mentioned painting nor staining. Mr. Palmquist stated that the Guidelines state that fences should be painted or stained an opaque color on main thoroughfares and stated that on the alley they don't have to be. Mr. Elmes stated that he was double checking. Mr. Palmquist stated that he is not sure whether they are going to paint or stain.

The meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

James Hill

Acting Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review