

## COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

### MINUTES

March 24, 2015

---

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, March 24, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present:            Mr. Bryan Green, Chair  
                                      Mr. Joshua Bilder (arrived at 4:13)  
                                      Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor  
                                      Mr. Nathan Hughes (arrived at 3:36)  
                                      Mr. Jason Hendricks  
                                      Mr. Mathew Elmes  
                                      Mr. Sanford Bond

Members absent:            Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair  
                                      Ms. Jennifer Wimmer

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

Others present:              See attached sign-in sheet

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

Mr. Hill introduced Ms. Marianne Pitts to the Commission as the new CAR Secretary.

#### **Presentation of Bus Rapid Transit Implementation by GRTC**

Mr. Steven McNally, Director of Engineering and Construction for GRTC came up and gave a presentation of the implementation of the Bus Rapid Transit and showed the locations and designs of the proposed stations.

Mr. Chip Badger, with Wendel Company who are the consultants working on the design of the proposed station, presented on where BRT stations will be located throughout the corridor. The Wendell Company is working on this project along with Kimley and Horn

Company who are focusing on issues with the roadways, utilities and other improvements.

Mr. Nick Mundy came up and gave a presentation of the designs and where they got the inspiration for the design aesthetic for the BRT Stations.

Ms. Gina Strait with Wendel came up and gave a brief presentation of the context of the stations and the safety issues.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor asked if there will be any parking on Broad Street where the BRT runs along the median. Mr. McNally stated that there will be a loss of 708 spaces, but they have been in communication with the neighborhoods and the community at large and working with their partners the City Of Richmond, Henrico, and the Department of Rail and Public Transit for GRTC to develop options to limit the loss of parking. Mr. McNally stated that it is a work in progress, and they will come up several options that they want to roll out to the public at their next public meetings on April 6 and 7. Mr. McNally stated that they will be able to conserve 75 to 85 percent of that lost parking. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the railings in the median stations and asked do they have a break through which pedestrians can pass, and Mr. McNally stated that it would be continuous.

Mr. Elmes thanked Mr. McNally and team for presenting to them and inquired if there is a reason why it jumps back and forth from the medians to the sides of the street, and Mr. McNally stated that it was their desire to have it run in the median the entire corridor but that the change in the width of Broad Street prevented the BRT from continuously running down the median. Mr. McNally stated that the roadway changes width throughout the corridor and that in the west, roadway width is about 82ft wide and in downtown, it reduces to 76ft.

Mr. Green inquired if they were redesigning the proposal between 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Street to limit the loss of parking and if the Commission could see the redesign now or if they would have to wait until the next public meeting. Mr. McNally stated that the team is considering options now and that it is a work in progress as they are working with the Planning Department and Public Works and would rather work through those issues and roll it out at one time at the public meeting. Mr. Green inquired what some of the options to avoid the loss of parking, and Mr. McNally stated that they are considering changes to lane width including looking at S2 standards and what width they can live with from a perspective of a priority of safety and operations. He stated that they are also looking at pedestrians and bicyclist access as well as north south access across Broad Street. Mr. McNally stated that they are looking at safety issues of control of pedestrian access at signalized intersections with control of left hand turns and stated that there are a number of features associated with the same issues of lane widths.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in looking at the median versus the curb side when the team was studying this, she wonders how projections of reduction in cars on Broad Street played into what the new layout of Broad Street would become as far as how many lanes would be needed for future projections of traffic. Mr. McNally stated that they have a 5 year study available on-line on the website and stated that there is a particular section that just deals with the traffic issues and the level of service with the traffic as well as for parking. Mr. McNally stated that it was determined in that study to push those issues to the engineering side so now they are in that analysis and going forward to make that work.

## Consent Agenda

Mr. Hill stated that item 14 and 16 were withdrawn from the agenda by the applicants and stated that at 425 N. 25<sup>th</sup> Street, the applicants understood that they had to further develop their design; and at 1914 E. Franklin, the applicants had some zoning requirements that would require changes to the plan as submitted. Mr. Hill stated that they are having a meeting with zoning and the applicant tomorrow.

Mr. Hill stated that when staff first met with the applicant for item #6, there was no railing present on the front porch so they suggested the installation of Richmond rail. Mr. Hill stated that when Ms. Pitts started working on the staff report she learned that there had been a railing with turned balusters in place at the time the district was designated. Mr. Hill stated that this late discovery was made after the agenda had been set and stated that this item might warrant additional discussion by the Commission as to whether staff's original recommendation to the applicant that the Richmond rail should be installed is appropriate or that turned balustrade similar to the historic turned balustrade removed by the applicant should be installed.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to move item # 6 from the consent agenda to the regular agenda to allow for this discussion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Elmes and passed 6-0-0.

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

**Application No. 15-031** (J. Carter-Lovejoy)

606 W. 19<sup>th</sup> Marshall Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Bond introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-031 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. Hendricks seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION:           WHEREAS, the applicant proposed to revise placement and orientation of approved garage, and

                                  WHEREAS, the condition that the applicant provide additional information on the proposed garage doors to the Commission staff for administrative approval, and

                                  WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted,

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

VOTE:                   Affirmative:   Bond, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, And Aarons-Sydnor

                                  Negative:       None

                                  Abstain:       None





**Application No. 15-035** (M. & K. Olgas)

2701 E. 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. 15-035 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. Hendricks seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION:           WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace deck frame and decking with AZEK, 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:   Elmes, Green, Hendricks, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Bond  
                                  Negative:       None  
                                  Abstain:       None



## REGULAR AGENDA

### Application No. 15-023 (Michaux, LLC)

601-601 ½ N. 23<sup>rd</sup> Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report for the applicant's request to construct two attached single-family houses on two vacant lots in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommended that the approval be conditioned on the brackets of the cornice aligning with the second-floor windows. Staff is recommending approval of the project with that condition.

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

Mr. Mike Alexander, the architect, came up and discussed some of the new renderings and answered questions.

Ms. Charlene Taylor, who owns the property next door to the project, inquired how far the property goes back and Mr. Alexander stated that it goes back 95 ft and then there is a 6 ft stretch that backs up to the building. Mr. Hill stated that he thinks the property line is six inches off the face of the existing building.

There were no additional comments from the public.

The Commission members discussed the project in detail and expressed their concerns about the window sill heights and concerns with the project addressing the corner.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented with the conditions in the staff report and with the condition that the alignment of the corbels in the front and the statement made by the applicant that the sill heights on the first floor will all align and not the head height of the windows as they follow around the building. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and failed 2-5-0 (Hendricks, Hughes, Bilder, Bond, Aarons-Sydnor opposed).

Mr. Bond made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendations noting that the head heights of all the windows and openings align on the side elevations and not the sill heights as submitted. There was no second and the motion failed.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to deny the application based on number 1 in the Guidelines under "Form" in the Standards for New Construction.

Mr. Green asked the applicant if they find the recommendations acceptable and Mr. Alexander stated yes and that he misunderstood about the uniformity at the last meeting.

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and failed 2-5-0 (Green, Elmes, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor and Bond opposed).

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the windows on the right elevation be extended to 6'-2" heights and the head heights of all windows align with the front elevation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 5-2-0 (Bilder and Hughes opposed).

RESOLUTION:           WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct two attached single-family houses, and  
  
                                  WHEREAS, the brackets of the cornice align with the second floor windows, and

WHEREAS, the first-floor windows on the right side elevation be 6'-2" in height to match the first-floor windows on the front elevation, and

WHEREAS, the head heights of all windows on each story be aligned, 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:   Aarons-Sydnor, Elmes, Green, Hendricks, and Bond  
                  Negative:       Bilder and Hughes  
                  Abstain:        None





**Application No. 15-030** (C. Keck)

512 W. 20<sup>th</sup> Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of work performed on the front of this property located in the Springhill Old and Historic District. Staff does not take issue with the installation of the cedar shake siding, the replacement of the porch piers and columns, the uncovering of the side lites, or the painting of the structure. Staff does not recommend approval of the installed door, which is a molded panel door with a single beveled glass lite. Staff does not recommend approval of the removal of the railing, as its repair or in-kind replacement would typically be recommended. Staff recommends that approval of the project be conditioned on the installation of a Richmond style rail with similar dimensions as the original railing as well as the replacement of the existing door with a true paneled, six-lite wood door with clear glass.

Mr. Green inquired if the stone piers were part of a prior approval and Mr. Palmquist stated no, that the prior approval only consisted of the removal of the aluminum siding and the replacement of smooth fiber cement siding and everything else was done without a permit.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if there was any discussion about the medallion or vent at the front center and Mr. Palmquist stated that they did not discuss that.

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

Mr. West Keck stated that this is his son's home and that he bought the property 4 years ago. He stated that he was not aware of the historic district designation. Mr. Keck stated that when they bought the house, the door was not a 15-lite door but a 6-lite door and stated that they got this door from the inside the house and it was 3 inches short. Mr. Keck stated that the brick columns were 2 inches out of plum and that they dug down and there was no foundation and were sitting on bricks. Mr. Keck stated that they went back with some stones to match the upper columns that were rotten and stated that the vents that are missing were aluminum vents and that they redid the porch with tongue and groove and a lot of it was rotten. Mr. Keck stated that they uncovered the side lites and that they are original and in good shape. Mr. Keck stated that the brown trim in his opinion should be white.

Mr. Green inquired about the material in the pediment and Mr. Keck stated that it is a Georgia Pacific composite material product.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the door they selected is acceptable and the only outstanding issue is them bringing back the railing porch.

Mr. Green inquired if Ms. Aarons-Sydnor was okay with the beveled door and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is okay with the form of the door but not the beveled glass.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the Commission typically doesn't approve stamped doors and beveled glass as noted in the staff report and stated that he doesn't take offense to the proportion of the new layout because there is not that much stone elsewhere in the neighborhood. Mr. Hendricks stated that he would like to see the handrail come back and that the door is still a concern.

Mr. Green stated that typically there are more variety of styles available and that there could be something else other than a 6-lite door that would be perfectly acceptable.

Mr. Elmes stated that this is an enforcement issue and whenever they have an enforcement issue they are guessing on what they would have approved had it been an actual application. He stated that it is onerous as a Commission to try and go back in time and fix things that have already been done. Mr. Elmes stated that the siding is beaded and they normally don't approve beaded siding or the cedar shake had they been a part of an original application. Mr. Elmes stated that they wouldn't have approved the door or the stone piers or column change. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were going to follow the staff report's recommendations and stated that they are pretty much following the Guidelines.

Mr. Hughes stated that they don't want to encourage people to make changes without conferring and then coming back later.

Mr. Green stated that he has similar issues and that he would have argued to the point that Mr. Elmes brought up that they use smooth hardieplank and not beaded siding. He stated that the masonry foundation is appropriate for this and not applied stone and the columns are a little too big. Mr. Green stated that it's not egregiously off in one category but states that it's a little off on every one.

Mr. Hughes stated that his biggest issue is that the applicant received approval from the Commission in September of 2010 to replace the aluminum siding on the structure with smooth fiber cement siding and that more work was done.

Mr. Bond inquired if any of the structural work done on the porch had a building permit and Mr. Palmquist stated no.

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with staff conditions with the installation of Richmond rail with similar dimensions as the original as well as the replacement of the existing door with true-paneled 6-lite wood door with clear glass. The motion was second by Mr. Bond.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she has an issue that something was approved and they did something different and stated that is the point of their job to make sure they do the work that is approved.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the applicant knows the process.

After further discussion the motion failed 3-4-0 (Hughes, Bilder, Hendricks, and Aarons-Sydnor opposed).

Mr. Bilder made a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Aarons-Sydnor and passed 5-2-0 (Green and Elmes opposed).



**Application No. 15-040** (M. Hawk)

1000 N. 25<sup>th</sup> Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for the installation of building-mounted wall signs advertising a planned, new restaurant at this structure in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff is concerned that the proposed signs are too large, and seem intended to be viewed by faster moving vehicles rather than by pedestrians. Staff feels that slightly smaller signs would still be easily read by either a motorist or pedestrian and would provide more harmony with the overall structure. Staff recommends that the signs be slightly reduced in size. A 25 % reduction in the size of the signs would result in two signs being 27"x 36", and one sign being 36"x 45". Staff recommends that the applicant verify with the Zoning division that the proposed signage does not exceed the allotted signage square footage for the building. Staff also recommends that the sign be attached to the building at the mortar joints, not through the brick.

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

Ms. Marian Hawk, the owner, came up to answer questions.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the project as presented with the staff's condition. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION:        WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install new building-mounted wall signs, and  
                              WHEREAS, the sign be reduced by 25% resulting in two 27"x 36" signs and one 36" x 45" sign, and  
                              WHEREAS, the sign be attached to the building at the mortar joints, not through the brick, 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:    Aarons-Sydnor, Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hughes, And Hendricks  
                              Negative:        None  
                              Abstain:        None

**Application No. 15-038** (L. Chavis)

873 N. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to install new porch railings and stair handrails to the front and rear porch of the primary structure on this property within the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends the replacement of removed railing on the front porch with in-kind materials to include turned balusters. Staff recommends that the applicants use a standard Richmond rail for both the porch and stair railings on the rear of the structure. The Commission may wish to consider whether it would be appropriate to require the applicant to include turned balusters in the proposed design as the Guidelines recommend that "when replacing a railing on a historic building which has lost its railing the first step is to look for documentary evidence which records the appearance of that railing". Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

There was no applicant present.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the applicant use turned balusters to match as closely as possible instead of Richmond rail on the front porch, and the rear porch stairs be installed as approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 6-0-0.

RESOLUTION:       WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install new rear steps; new railings/handrails at front and rear porches, and  
  
                          WHEREAS, the front porch railing be replaced with turned balusters to match as closely as possible the historic turned balusters, and  
  
                          WHEREAS, Richmond rail be used for the rear porch and stair railings, 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:   Aarons-Sydnor, Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hughes, And Hendricks  
  
                          Negative:       None  
  
                          Abstain:       None

**Application No. 15-028** (C. Maxwell)

507 N. Henry Street

Mr. Palmquist presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval of work performed on the property which consisted of the removal of an historic baluster at the top of the front porch, as well as the addition of a metal gate on the second story to prevent access to the roof of the front porch. The balustrade at the top of the front porch consisted of an important character-defining feature of the structure and its removal resulted in the significant loss of historic character. For this reason, staff cannot recommend the approval of this removed feature. Staff recommends that the approval of the installed second-floor gate as it is of a simple design that is compatible with other black metal and wrought iron features found throughout the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. Staff recommends partial approval of the project.

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

There were no applicants present.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

Commission discussion began.

Mr. Elmes made a motion for a partial approval for the reasons stated that in the staff report that the handrail on the second floor be considered a contributing feature to the structure and should be either replaced as it was removed or be rebuilt to match the sister house's hand rail per the staff recommendation in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor.

Mr. Hill inquired if they should characterize this as a denial of approval of its removal. Mr. Elmes stated that he is trying to reference the staff report and stated that he is denying the removal of the handrail and supporting the replacement of the handrail as noted in the staff report and in the Guidelines.

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

RESOLUTION:        WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to remove balustrade and install metal gate, and  
                              WHEREAS, the installing of the second floor gate, and  
                              WHEREAS, the Commission denied the removal of the historic balustrade, 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:    Aarons-Sydnor, Bilder, Elmes, Green, Hughes, And Hendricks  
                              Negative:        None  
                              Abstain:         None

\*Mr. Elmes recused himself

**Application No. 15-032** (M. & P. Prescott)

3000 Libby Terrace

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to rehabilitate an existing garage in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. Staff recommends that the existing carriage style doors should be retained and repaired or reworked to become operable while maintaining the same exterior appearance. Staff is recommending approval of the project with a condition.

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

There was no applicant present.

There were no additional comments from members of the public.

The Commission discussion began.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to approve the application for the reasons and conditions in the staff report with the intent that the exterior appearance be maintained and defer the materials to Commission staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bilder.

After further discussion the motion passed 5-0-0.

RESOLUTION:        WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace roofing in-kind, install gutters, replace doors, and

                              WHEREAS, the exterior appearance of the existing garage door be maintained, and

                              WHEREAS, the applicant provide additional information on a new design for the garage door to Commission staff for administrative review and approval, and

                              WHEREAS, the application is approved as submitted, and

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

VOTE:                    Affirmative:    Aarons-Sydnor, Bilder, Green, Hughes and Hendricks

                              Negative:        None

                              Abstain:         None

The Commission members had a brief discussion regarding the Bus Rapid Transportation Bus Implementation regarding the parking and came to a consensus to send a letter of concern.

**Secretary Report**

Mr. Hill discussed the revised title page for the Guidelines. Mr. Hill stated that they received a preliminary information form for the Carillon neighborhood which a residential area, and as the City is a certified local government, staff and the Commission can comment on this request before it goes to the state review board to be designated a National Register District. Mr. Hill stated that staff will review and make a presentation to the Commission and provide them a copy of it.

Mr. Hill stated that the Historic Richmond Foundation is sponsoring a Preservation Expo on April 18<sup>th</sup> from 10 to 2pm at Dovetail Construction on Brook Road and stated that CAR staff will be there to participate to have a table where they can answer questions about the Old and Historic Districts.

Mr. Hill distributed the updated meeting and quarterly meetings dates and stated that there is Quarterly meeting scheduled for April 14<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Hill requested Commission members send in ideas or topics for this meeting’s agenda.

**Administrative Approvals**

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

<u>Address</u>	<u>Summary</u>	<u>Approval No.</u>
3317 Monument Avenue	Addition and elevator shaft	A15-052
1101 W. Grace Street	Installation of white, 3” round Metal downspouts at both sides Of front porch and at right side Doorway stoop, to be installed Where downspouts previously Existed at the drainage holes Of internal gutter systems	A15-053
3516 E. Broad Street	Detached garage per plans	A15-054
3603 E. Marshall Street	New Houses	A15-055
2311 Venable Street	Installation of (replacement) Carrier gas furnace and AC Adding ductwork on 2 <sup>nd</sup> level	A15-056
3321 E. Marshall Street	Install 200 amp service (going From duplex to single family) light Remodeling wire kit	A15-057
7 N. Jefferson Street	Guest room construction Phase 2 only 53 total rooms And connecting corridors. No Work at stairs or elevators	A15-058
2504 W. Grace Street	Demolish several exist walls Add some walls; install new baths Kitchens; install new plumbing, Heating and electrical (the main Building will have 4 apts and garage	A15-059

	Apt will stay as existing. See attached Drawings).	
220 N. 20 <sup>th</sup> Street	Demolish structure. Remove and Dispose of all debris in an approved Landfill. Seed and straw. DOL Notification. Miss Utility notification. Removal of tree in front yard.	A15-060
611 N. 21 Street	Install two heat pumps with duct Systems	A15-061
613 N. 21 Street	Install two heat pumps with Duct systems	A15-062
4017 Hermitage Road	Installation of black, wrought Iron handrails on both sides of Front porch steps	A15-063
2808 E. Marshall Street	Fire wall detailing (plan revision)	A15-064
3107 E. Marshall Street	Painting the body of house "Revival Grey, "trim "Artic White And door a robin's blue color	A15-065
2120 E. Broad Street	Tie into existing gas line. Install gas Line to home owner's fireplace With cut off valve. Gasoline Only no hookup.	A15-066
801 N. 23 <sup>rd</sup> Street	Installation of a walk-in cooler On a wooden platform at the rear Of the building with small trees Planted in the backyard to screen The cooler from the street	A15-067
3001 E. Marshall Street	Install/replace sewer line (up to 10 ft with 4" PVC) Install/replace Water line (up to 50 ft with 1"). Also Need right of way to tap into City main.	A15-068
405 N. Allen Avenue	Remove existing gas furnace. Install New gas furnace. Reconnect to existing Duct and gas connections. Like For like replacement.	A15-069
3412 E. Broad Street	Navien water heater, furnace Cooktop. Running gas lines to Above fixtures	A15-070
2119 Cedar Street	Renovate existing structure	A15-070
2117 Cedar Street	Renovate existing structure	A15-071
2117 Cedar Street	Repair retaining wall. Tie into House footer	A15-072
2709 W. Grace Street	Install porch light, GFCI Outlet at porch front, GFCI Outlet at balcony, ground Flood lights	A15-073
516 W. Marshall Street	Sure up porch (front) floor And lay new T & G flooring. Install new railings and install New fence (front).	A15-074

**Approval of the Minutes:**

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the February 24<sup>th</sup> minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 6-0-0.

**Committee Report from UDC**

Mr. Green stated that the Urban Design Committee reviewed 5 items and stated that there was a series of streetscape improvements between S. 12<sup>th</sup> Street and Virginia Street including curb upgrades and other street improvements. Mr. Green stated that the other item was the sign for the Manchester Courthouse which has been renamed "Henry L. Marsh, III, and Harold M. Marsh, Sr., Manchester Courthouse. Mr. Green stated that there was a conceptual review for a new street which is going to connect two sections of Deep Water Terminal and stated that it is all industrial now and there will be provisions for sidewalks. Mr. Green stated that there is another project with 2 parts on Commerce Road where the City is relocating all of its repair and maintenance facilities from their locations on the Boulevard to Commerce Road. Mr. Green stated that it is interesting that one of the buildings is going to be LEED Certified and the other building is not because of the size requirements.

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

---

Marianne Pitts

Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review