

COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

MINUTES

December 15, 2015

The meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review was held on Tuesday, December 15, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in the Fifth Floor Conference Room in City Hall.

Members present: Mr. Bryan Green, Chair (Left at 5:40)
 Mr. Joseph Yates, Vice-Chair
 Ms. Rebecca Aarons-Sydnor
 Mr. Jason Hendricks
 Mr. Nathan Hughes
 Mr. Mathew Elmes (arrived at 3:51)
 Mr. Andrew McRoberts (Left at 5:45)
 Mr. James Klaus
 Mr. Sanford Bond (left at 6:15)

Members absent: None

Staff Present: Ms. Marianne Chen, CAR Secretary
 Ms. Tara Ross, Recording Secretary
 Ms. Kimberly Chen, PDR

Others present: See attached sign-in sheet

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

Approval of the Minutes:

Mr. McRoberts made a motion to approve the October minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 7-0-0.

Secretary Report

Ms. Pitts stated that item #11 for 125 N. 25th Street was withdrawn by the applicant. Ms. Pitts distributed the new construction guidelines for corner properties that Mr. Green worked on for the members to review. Ms. Pitts stated that the Commission can view it and they can discuss it and vote on at the January meeting. Ms. Pitts stated that the members have a checklist regarding new construction that they wanted to bring back to the Commission which consists of what kind of items that they would require from

applicants and what kind of things the Commission would like to see in new construction. Ms. Pitts stated that the next quarterly meeting is scheduled for January 12th and stated that the Commission needs to work on finding a venue and the time. Ms. Pitts stated that the Director Mr. Olinger of the Planning Department was hoping that they could focus the quarterly meeting on the focus of new construction and what the Commission would like to see in terms of projects going in the old and historic districts. Mr. McRoberts stated that the Commission could meet at his office at 6:30.

Mr. Green stated that they can talk more about the corner site location at the quarterly meeting and vote on it at the regular meeting.

Administrative Approvals

Ms. Pitts distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 38 approvals for the period from November 9, 2015 through December 15, 2015.

Partial List of Administrative Approvals (Building Permits and Certificate Applications) Issued by Commission Staff

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
7 N 29TH ST		12/7/2015	E15120314	12/11/2015	A15-553	Wire new kitchen, 3rd floor and other misc wiring	Approved for interior work and wiring for exterior future. Proposed exterior future must be submitted to CAR staff for review and approval	MP
521 CATHERINE ST		12/10/2015	E15120613	12/11/2015	A15-554	Service upgrade from 100 to 200A	Equipment to be located in same location as existing	MP
519 N ADAMS ST		12/8/2015	B15120703	12/11/2015	A15-555	Repoint foundation, secure handrails, repair window screens, stabilize rear deck, replace windows, replace rotten trim, paint	Approved for repair work and limited in-kind replacement of deteriorated elements as described. Any change in material or design must be reviewed by the CAR	MP
211 N 36TH ST		12/4/2015	B15113002	12/11/2015	A15-556	Remodel kitchen and full bath, 2nd floor - enclose back porch to create new master suite. Renovate attic to include home office and new full bathroom	Plans are consistent with CAR approval from 8/25/15	MP
514 N 25TH ST		12/7/2015	E15120110	12/11/2015	A15-557	Wire to code	Approved for interior work. Applicant must contact CAR for approval of the installation of any new exterior lighting fixtures	MP
15 N BOULEVARD		12/4/2015	N15120303	12/11/2015	A15-558	Replace existing gas water (75 gallon) heater with same	Approved for the replacement of water heater with the same	MP
15 N BOULEVARD		12/4/2015	M15120310	12/11/2015	A15-559	Replace existing gas boiler with same	Approved for replacement of existing gas boiler with same	MP
873 N 22ND ST		12/4/2015	B15120301	12/11/2015	A15-560	Insulate, shetrock, renovate kitchen, baths, laundry room, interior paint, install carpet, interior trim. No structural or change of layout	Approved for interior work only. No exterior changes including alterations to windows are permitted as part of this application	MP
1814 E FRANKLIN ST		12/4/2015	B15120311	12/11/2015	A15-561	Removal of existing membrane roof and installation of new .050 durolast membrane roof. Like for like	Approved for roof replacement to match existing	MP
319 N 32ND ST		12/10/2015	N15121005	12/10/2015	A15-562	Replace 15 feet of 3/4 inch black iron gas piping to gas furnace	Approved for gas piping as described	MP

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
319 N 32ND ST		12/6/2015	M1511004	12/10/2015	A15-563	Remove heat pump and replace with 60,000 BTU gas furnace/AC	Approved for installation of gas furnace in same location as existing heat pump	MP
2123 E MARSHALL ST		12/7/2015	P15111002	12/9/2015	A15-564	Add two bathrooms, move two kitchen sinks, plumbing. Interior work only	Approved for interior work	MP
2123 E MARSHALL ST		12/7/2015	E15111001	12/9/2015	A15-565	Add circuits for new bathrooms, run power as needed. Electrical, interior work only	Approved for interior work	MP
2504 W GRACE ST		12/4/2015	P15120303	12/9/2015	A15-566	New plumbing	Approved for interior work only. No exterior work including changes to windows is authorized by this permit	MP
2322 W GRACE ST		12/8/2015	P15120306	12/9/2015	A15-567	Plumbing and piping of studio bath with sump	Approved for interior work only. Exterior changes, including changes to windows, are not authorized by this permit	MP
2604 E FRANKLIN ST		11/12/2015	B15111204	12/9/2015	A15-568	Remodel 1st and 2nd floors per attached plans. Replace windows (not all) and rear porch. I have spoke with Kim Chen and submitted proposed work. Interior remodel and replace porch	Approved per CAR review on 11/24/15. Porch reconstruction to include a handrail to match historic handrail and the windows to be 2/2, wood, simulated divided lite windows	MP
1142 W GRACE ST		12/9/2015	R15110401	12/9/2015	A15-569	Install fire alarm system, per NFPA 72, for location above	Approved for fire alarm system installation	MP
536 N 2ND ST		12/3/2015	R15113001	12/9/2015	A15-570	Install FA system to monitor sprinkler system	Approved as submitted. Backflow preventer to be located inside structure as indicated on plans	MP
2610 E CLAY ST		11/19/2015	B15111804	12/3/2015	A15-571	Per Project Home's write up, trim, doors, exterior walls, staircase and railings	Approved for repair and in-kind replacement. Vinyl siding replacement shall be limited to approximately 30s f. to be located on the upper rear of the right side of the structure	MP
105 S BOULEVARD		11/9/2015	B15110611	12/1/2015	A15-572	Frame in closets in bedrooms. Frame in pantry and 1/2 bath on first floor. Frame in utility room. No bearing walls to be installed or moved	Approved for interior work only. No changes to the exterior, including windows, is authorized by this permit	MP

Tuesday, December 15, 2015

Page 2 of 4

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
125 N 25TH ST		12/1/2015	P15120106	12/2/2015	A15-573	Replace 199,000 BTU natural gas hot water heater. Like for like	Water heater to be located in same location as existing water heater	MP
2312 W GRACE ST		12/1/2015	E15120109	12/2/2015	A15-574	Wire 240V circuit from panel to air handlers of new heat pump systems	Heat pump to be located in same location as existing heat pump	MP
2312 W GRACE ST		12/1/2015	M15120105	12/2/2015	A15-575	Remove aquatherm/AC, and replace with 3 ton heat pump with ductwork	Heat pump to be located in same location as existing heat pump	MP
2028 MONUMENT AV		11/24/2015	E15112404	12/1/2015	A15-576	Remodel kitchen	Approved for interior work only. No exterior changes authorized as part of this permit	MP
1828 MONUMENT AV		11/25/2015	N15112002	12/1/2015	A15-577	Install gas piping to four log sets with regulators	Approved for interior work and exterior work limited to gas piping as described	MP
101 W FRANKLIN ST		11/25/2015	R15112001	12/1/2015	A15-578	Renovation of Phase IV upgrade of strobe devices on floors basement, mid mezzanine, mezzanine, roof and James River House floors 1 and 2	Approved as proposed	MP
1606 W GRACE ST		10/26/2015	B15102315	11/30/2015	A15-579	Remove existing floor, replace with 1"x3-1/2" T&G HDPE, repair rd as necessary with like material	Approved per CAR review on 11/24/15 for the replacement of front porch decking with "Evolve" brand HDPE 1"x3-1/2" T&G flooring in light gray	MP
1015 E CLAY ST	11/4/2015			11/16/2015	A15-580	Reconstruction of the brick retaining wall on the southern border of the Valetine Garden and museum property		MP
2220 E MARSHALL ST		11/13/2015	E15111309	11/30/2015	A15-581	Relocate 150 amp electrical panel, add rear outside light and receptacle, relocate from outside (back of house) to inside of house and install new exterior back light	Approved for relocating the panel and wiring for exterior light and fixture. Must consult CAR staff for approval of fixture type	MP
418 N 25TH ST		11/18/2015	S15111701	11/30/2015	A15-582	Re-install refurbished blade sign at 52.4 sq ft and one canopy with two marquee signs at 24 sq ft each	Plans are consistent with CAR administrative approval A15-321	MP

Tuesday, December 15, 2015

Page 3 of 4

Address	CoA Received	BP Received	BP No.	Date Approved	Approval No.	Summary of Work	Condition of Approval	Issued By
2011 VENABLE ST		11/9/2015	B15111805	11/25/2015	A15-583	Complete renovation of single-family house	Plans conform to CAR approval from 11/25/13. Missing windows shall be aluminum clad wood SCL windows. Wood siding remain or replaced in kind where deteriorated. The front porch shall be restored in-kind using salvaged materials from old porch	MP
2309 W GRACE ST		11/18/2015	B15111801	11/24/2015	A15-584	11'x20' saltwater, concrete pool installation in rear of 2309 W Grace St	Pool and equipment will be screened from public view by existing privacy fence	MP
200 N 22ND ST		11/23/2015	B15111702	11/24/2015	A15-585	Temporary tent installation	Approved for temporary tent from 12/3/15 to 12/4/15	MP
2504 W GRACE ST		11/20/2015	M15111902	11/24/2015	A15-586	Installing one 1-1/2 ton heat pump and ductwork, installing three 2-ton heat pumps and ductwork	Heat pumps to be located at the rear of the structure and screened from public view by existing garage and privacy fence	MP
520 W BROAD ST		11/20/2015	B15112013	11/20/2015	A15-587	Re-roof, like for like, no structural, flat roof	Approved for re-roofing with in-kind materials	MP
2100 M ST		12/15/2015	E15121501	12/15/2015	A15-588	Wire house to electrical code	Approved per CAR approval 6/23/15	MP
608 N 27TH ST		12/10/2015	E15120806	12/15/2015	A15-589	Wire for new single-family dwelling with detached garage	Approved per CAR approval 6/23/15	MP
603 N 21ST ST		12/15/2015	E15121502	12/15/2015	A15-590	Wire house to electrical code	Approved per CAR approval on 7/28/15	MP

Tuesday, December 15, 2015

Page 4 of 4

Ms. Pitts stated that there were a few that came up for building permit approval that wasn't consistent with the CAR approvals and stated that the Commission will see projects that were previously approved come back to the Commission because of changes. Ms. Pitts stated that it seems that with new construction projects applicants will go through the CAR process and then meet with zoning and building which results in several changes to the project and stated that they have the tools that allows the Chair to look at whether they are substantial conformance with their previous approval. Ms. Pitts stated that it seems that most of these projects based on the number and scope of changes are not in substantial conformance and stated that the tool hasn't been used as intended.

Mr. Green stated that they have had some issues and stated that if zoning required some minor changes the applicants wouldn't have to come back to the Commission again because the Chair could approve it. Mr. Green stated that what appears to be happening is that people are making major changes and stated that recently an applicant have changed every window and door and stated that is not in the spirit of what they intended. Mr. Green stated that major substantial changes must come back to the Commission and stated that they could discuss it further at the quarterly meeting to tighten up the language for that.

Ms. Chen stated that staff is meeting with the Department Director Mr. Olinger and the head of zoning to see if they could come up with some sort of initial review process so that some of these projects in review they could be headed off so they could know if they do meet the Zoning Guidelines and building compliance. Ms. Chen stated that the director is pretty committed that all projects coming to the 5th floor should be originating on the 1st floor in Zoning and Building.

Enforcement Report

Ms. Pitts stated that they went out two weeks ago with Mr. Palmquist and looked at 35 items following up with some and sending out notices of violations and stated that there will be more violations on the next agenda. Ms. Pitts stated that she has to follow up with the City Attorney about Monument Avenue windows and Mr. Green inquired if there had been clarification on what the judge meant and Ms. Pitts stated that Mr. Hill was working closely with that but states that she is going to follow up with the City Attorney. The Commission members briefly discussed the court case.

Mr. Green briefly discussed the new checklist for new applications.

The Commission briefly had a discussion on corner houses and how they treat secondary corner elevations more appropriately.

Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Mr. Klaus to move item #8 for 225 W. Broad Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and passed 9-0-0.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if item # 1 windows will have clear glass and Ms. Pitts stated yes.

A motion was made by Mr. Green to move item # 16 for 221 Jefferson Avenue from the regular to the consent agenda. Mr. Green stated that he is the cross over person from the UDC and he and the Chairperson wrote a quick note that if any plantings came up that they will review them with staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the motion was with staff recommendations and Mr. Green stated yes.

Mr. Yates stated that they are adding a water feature and wants to make sure this is something that easily maintainable.

Mr. Green stated that is one of the things they wrote in the UDC staff report that they ask for more information about the water feature.

After further discussion the motion passed 9-0-0.

A motion was made by Mr. Yates to move item # 7 for 2123 E. Marshall Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda with staff's recommendations that they require Richmond Rails and the mechanical unit be screened and owner proposed to do so. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes. Mr. Klaus stated that he noticed that the doors are out of alignment. Ms. Pitts stated that they are all existing doors.

Mr. Elmes stated that he would like more discussion A-gable porch roof on the rear. Ms. Pitts stated that she discussed with the applicant about not have the awning over the door and the applicant is comfortable removing it per the staff recommendations. After further discussion the motion passed 9-0-0.

A motion was made by Mr. McRoberts to approve the consent agenda with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and passed 9-0-0.

VOTE:	Affirmative:	Elmes, Hendricks, Klaus, McRoberts, Yates, Hughes, Green, Aaron-Sydnor and Bond
	Negative:	None
	Abstain:	None

Application No. 15-156 (Museum District, LLC)

2215 Monument Avenue

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Mc. Roberts introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-156 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 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to remove walls to restore first floor rear porch, 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Hendricks, Klaus, McRoberts, Bond, Green, Yates, Aaron-Sydnor and Hughes

Negative: None

Abstain: None

Application No. 15-158 K. Sherry & A. Braddock)

307 N. 29th 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. Mc. Roberts introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-156 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 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace a metal porch roof with a modified bitumen roof membrane with a granulated surface, 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Hendricks, Klaus, McRoberts, Aaron-Sydnor, Bond, Green, Yates and Hughes
Negative: None
Abstain: None

Application No. 15-131 (J. Gross)

2123 E. Marshall Street

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Mc. Roberts introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-131 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 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a new rear porch and install roof mounted mechanical equipment, and

 WHEREAS, the screening of the mechanical equipment be painted or opaquely stained in a color to be administratively approved by staff, and

 WHEREAS, the railing be a standard Richmond rail design that is more compatible with the district, or the proposed pickets be placed on the inside of the handrail for a more finished appearance, and

 WHEREAS, no awning is to be installed over the 2nd story rear door, 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Hendricks, Klaus, McRoberts, Aaron-Sydnor, Bond, Green, Yates and Hughes

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-148 (C. Kiniry)

225 W. 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. Mc. Roberts introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-148 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 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to install a vehicle charging station in a parking lot, 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Hendricks, Klaus, McRoberts, Aaron-Sydnor, Bond, Green, Yates and Hughes
 Negative: None
 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-159 (DPRCF)

2221 Jefferson Avenue

There being no Commission discussion, this item was approved as submitted. The staff report reflects the Commission's reasons for consent agenda approval. Mr. Mc. Roberts introduced a motion to approve Application No. 15-159 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 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a pocket park,
and
WHEREAS, the proposed signage and any lighting plan must
come back before the Commission for review and
recommendation to the City Planning Commission, and
WHEREAS, the planting schedule and maintenance plan be
submitted for administrative review and approval by staff, the
chair, and the Urban Design Committee Chair, 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Hendricks, Klaus, McRoberts, Aaron-
Sydnor, Bond, Green, Yates and Hughes
Negative: None
Abstain: None

REGULAR AGENDA

Application No. 15-144 (W. Hinden)

3305-3307 E. Marshall Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval for exterior modifications as part of the rehabilitation of a double residential building in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. Staff has evidence of alterations throughout the years through previous enforcement activity and Commission reviews from the 1990's. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

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

Mr. Western Hinden, representing the owner, came up to answer questions.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application as presented as far as the rear porches go and allow the applicants per the Guidelines to construct the porches as drawn to allow the first floor decking material of the porches to be at grade level can be a paver, concrete, grass or crush and run material as long as it does have a handrail surrounding it and so that it appears to match porches on the adjacent building, and regarding the front porches structure they can be repaired in-kind or one of the two options which will be the 1977 photograph or the porches on the adjacent building which will have to be reconstructed and turned it to staff to be approved administratively.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a friendly amendment that staff's recommendation for painting is the motion. Mr. Elmes accepted the amendment.

After further discussion the motion passed 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to replace existing front porch, construct new rear 2 story porches, and install new windows and doors, and

WHEREAS, the rear porches be at grade level, and

WHEREAS, the front porch be either repaired in-kind, reconstructed to match the photograph of the property from the Historic Richmond Foundation's 1977 Church Hill Survey, or reconstructed to match the porches at 3309-3011 East Marshall Street, and

WHEREAS, a single lite transom be installed over the proposed new doors, and

WHEREAS, the porches be painted or opaquely stained in color to be administratively 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

106 E. Clay Street

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

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

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the application with the proposed wooden case steel columns and for the reasons discussed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes modifications to previously approved plans to change the porch piers to chamfered wood piers, 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE:	Affirmative:	Elmes, Bond, Green, Hughes, McRoberts, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus and Hendricks
	Negative:	None
	Abstain:	None

Application No. 15-147 (J. Carter-Lovejoy)

606 W. 19th Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report for the applicant's request approval to modify the plans for the construction of a single-family house on a parcel in the Springhill Old and Historic District. The application before the Commission incorporates the changes requested by the Commission. Staff recommends the upper windows be relocated to align with the windows below. Additionally, the lower window appear to be missing the trim that is shown on all other windows, therefore, staff recommends the applicant to install trim on these windows. Staff recommends approval of the proposed project as submitted with conditions.

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

Ms. Janice Carter-Lovejoy, the owner, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Pitts stated that a resident came in and gave his support for the project.

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

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 9-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes modifications to previously approved plans to change the porch piers to chamfered wood piers, and

 WHEREAS, the upper windows at the rear be relocated to align with the windows below, and

 WHEREAS, the trim be installed on the lower windows at the rear to match all other windows, 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Elmes, Bond, Green, Hughes, McRoberts, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor, Klaus and Hendricks

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-149 (J. & R. Taylor)

800 N. 21st Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to infill an existing window opening with brick on the first floor Venable Street elevation of a structure at the northeast corner of Venable and North 21st in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. As the work has been completed, staff is concerned that the removal of the installed brick would result in damage to the surrounding brick. Staff recommends the in-filled brick remain in place to avoid damage to the historic brick. Staff recommends approval of the proposed project as submitted.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the brick is in the same plane and not recessed and Ms. Pitts stated yes and stated that there was 1 email from the public.

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

Ms. Rajean Taylor, the owner, stated that they apologize for not submitting an application and stated that she wasn't aware that she needed to do it. Ms. Taylor stated that there was work being done by a contractor and he agreed to fill in their window. Ms. Taylor stated that they appreciate the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Green stated that they have one letter in opposition to this project.

Mr. Klaus stated that he is not speaking against staff recommendations and stated that she is alerting them of things that is going in the neighborhood.

Mr. Green stated that in the past they have allowed brick masonry openings and stated that typical they ask for the openings to be recessed and the brick be setback.

Mr. Elmes stated that to reiterate some of the strong feeling that have been reported in the past and stated that if they allow this to happen why are they here as a Commission. Mr. Elmes stated that there is a brand new Cush wall brick with new grey mortar in an historic opening and stated that the brick doesn't match or is it inset in a way to match it. Mr. Elmes stated that the Guidelines are clear on page 65 and read the Guidelines and stated that it is strongly discouraged and this is a primary façade and a highly visible building on a very visible corner and stated that it takes away from the rhythm of the fenestration of the building. Mr. Elmes stated that the way the masonry was in-filled is completely wrong and there is no way that he can support it.

Mr. Yates stated that he echoes Mr. Elmes concerns verbatim.

Mr. Green inquired if they would feel any different if the brick would have been set back.

Mr. Elmes stated that it would have to be drastically overshadowing health and safety or life safety reason for the infill to begin with and stated that there would have to have been an application and discussion about it and then Guidelines for infill of masonry openings would have to been considered. Me. Elmes stated that in looking at what is there now and stated no that he has sympathy for the situation.

Mr. Yates stated that it is possible that the windows could have been in-filled from the inside so that it read as an actual opening.

Mr. Green inquired if a lime wash would change their opinion. Mr. Elmes stated that it is modern brick with modern mortar.

Mr. James Taylor, the owner, stated that the reason that the infill was done was because they have no access to the window from the inside of the building and stated that they have the frames inside but they have no access from the inside of the building. Mr.

Taylor stated that it requires a tremendous amount of work because there is a closet in place as well and stated that they utilized the best bricks they could find to do the infill. Mr. Taylor stated that they also took care not to damage the lintels because at some point if they are able to do a complete interior renovation it is their intent to return the window to service. Mr. Taylor stated that all of the windows were covered with wood initially and stated that they can put the wood back up if the Commission would like them to. Mr. Taylor stated that they will not destroy the inside at this time to comply with that exterior problem.

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

Mr. Hughes inquired if there was a concern that it will damage the brick around the exterior historic brick.

Mr. Elmes stated that according to the applicant their desire at some point is to reverse that situation if the situation presents itself. Mr. Elmes stated that they didn't keyed it in and the mortar itself is a little more harder than in the existing lime that is on the other brick and stated that there is a small potential for damage.

Mr. Green stated that it is not too thin and stated that if it would have been too thin to the side brick then yes removing it would be difficult and damaging.

Mr. Yates stated that it is a prominent building on a prominent street and stated that they look at each application individually. Mr. Yates stated that he can guarantee that if they approve this it will come back to them numerous times and when somebody else wants to close up windows they will look at this project as a precedent.

Mr. Hughes stated that he supports what he has heard so far and stated that nothing sounds onerous.

Mr. McRoberts stated that he don't fault the owner for wanting to brick it in because they have no access to it and stated that the big concern is that they didn't go through an application process and even if it was allowed it wouldn't be allowed like this. Mr. McRoberts stated that he is very concerned with the points that have been made about setting a precedence which concerns him. Mr. McRoberts stated that the other concern is staff's concern about damaging the brick and stated what it sounds like to him is that it needs further discussion.

Mr. Green stated that this is something that he is struggling with because normally this is not something that they would approve and is wondering if it is reversible.

Mr. Hughes stated that they could come back to the Commission and get approval to do it properly.

Mr. Green stated that part of the concern with this technique is that what the damage is when you take it out.

Mr. Hendricks stated that the only difference between this and other brick infill's is that it's not recessed and stated that the applicant stated that the back is not accessible and typically with a permit they would have requested that it be setback.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that a few like this over the years where the closet or bathroom and they requested that they reconfigure the brick in the window but states that it was never on such a primary elevation or on a prominent building. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that those situation are different from this because of the prominent elevation and the building itself. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is struggling with it

also and don't know what the alternatives are but states that she doesn't want to set a precedence either.

Mr. Green stated the lintels and sills are in place and stated that the brick and mortar color aren't something that they would select but it does set the opening out and the opening is new.

Mr. Bond stated that the precedence of the situation has to be paramount and stated that as Mr. Elmes stated that they see this kind of thing all the time and if they do it what good are they.

Mr. Elmes stated that in theory they are supposed to take everything on a case by case basis and not set precedence and stated that there is not an easy solution and inquired how many times they going to vote for something that is wrong. Mr. Elmes stated that all of the solutions that they are reporting are basically are ideas to mitigate the situation.

Mr. Green stated that is where he got the idea of doing a dark lime wash on the brick.

Mr. Yates stated that they should defer the application and have staff to work with the applicant to find a wash that might mitigate the appearance.

Mr. Elmes inquired if there was a glazed window in the opened brick. Mr. Taylor stated that there is framing behind there that he maintained and stated that overtime it will darken. Mr. Taylor stated that he will prefer not to take the brick down and put the wood back up but states that given that there is no other alternative that is what he is going to do. Mr. Elmes stated that there is a framework behind the brick and stated that there are no sashes and Mr. Taylor stated that the sashes are in place it's just no access from inside and stated that he tried to get the guys to take down the sashes but states that they had no control over interior windows. Mr. Taylor stated that there might be something that he could do to darken the bricks.

Mr. Green stated that he thinks the wash would darken the bricks.

Mr. Yates made a motion to defer the application to give the owners an opportunity to work with staff and a member of the Commission to get an appropriate lime wash to darken the brick or mitigate. The motion was seconded by Ms. Aarons-Sydnor and passed 8-1-0 (McRoberts opposed).

Application No. 15-151 (B. Blair)

2615 E. Broad Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to paint a mural on the western wall of an existing brick carriage house in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The wall is currently unpainted brick with cement filters an exposed mounting joints. The applicant is proposing to paint a mural that will cover the entire façade using colors from the paint palette in the Commission's Guidelines. Staff recommends denial of the project as submitted.

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

There was no applicant present.

Mr. John Albers, speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak on the project and supports staff recommendation for denial.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to deny the project as submitted based on the CAR Mural Guidelines for unpainted brick on a residential building. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and passed 9-0-0.

Application No. 15-153 (M .Green)

409 N. Madison Street

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request approval to replace an existing metal roof on a home in the Jackson Ward Old and Historic District. The existing roof is metal standing seam roof that is visible from the public right of way. Staff recommends denial of the project as submitted.

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

Ms. Millie Green, partial owner, stated that they have faced a lot of problems with the interior of the building with termites and rotten wood. Ms. Green stated that the yearly rent of the building does not cover the price of the roof replacement and stated that water is a big problem. Ms. Green stated that the roofer gave them a price for the roof that they proposed and stated that they would like to ask the Commission what other materials can be used in-kind.

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

Mr. Green inquired if the roofer look at any repair prices for the roof and Ms. Green stated that it can't be repaired and stated that the patches that they see are the patches the contractor just put up about two months ago because it was raining in the house. Ms. Green stated that they had to replace ceiling upstairs and stated that it is important for them to replace the roof as soon as possible but states that with that price it is going to be an impossibility.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that there is a TPO product that they can buy and basically fake ribs for.

Mr. Green asked the Commission members how they felt about a TPO roof with or without ribs. Mr. Bond stated that he don't think it looks the same. Mr. Green stated that the thing with ribs is that they warp over time.

Mr. Hughes stated that he will hate to see that building loose that metal roof and stated that if it is beyond repair.

Mr. Elmes stated that there are some coatings they are renovation and restoration coating that have been used on metal roofs very successfully and stated that would be cheaper even than the TPO option. Mr. Elmes stated that he knows that time is of the essence because of the weather situation and stated that exploring this with someone who might be more knowledgeable of renovation and restoration might be worth checking into. Mr. Elmes stated that they are commercially available at local roofing supply houses which would predicate the expense of tearing off this roof and replacing it. Mr. Elmes stated that it would be worth asking the applicant to work with staff or check with more historically minded roofers and stated that it is a money saving solution.

Mr. Bond stated that the material is readily available.

Mr. Green made a motion to defer the project as submitted and ask that the applicant work with staff to investigate some of the modern poly acrylic coating that may be used to extend the life of the roof and Commission member will work with staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates.

The Commission members briefly discussed the motion.

After further discussion the motion passed 8-1-0(Hughes opposed).

Application No. 15-154 (M. Shubert)

2220 E. Marshall Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's requests approval to rehabilitate a home located in the Church Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends that the applicant install wood trim rather than the proposed PVC trim. Staff also recommends approval of the proposed alterations to the front porch with the condition that the applicant submit details of the proposed handrail for staff to review and administratively approve. Staff recommends approval of the installation of the units with the condition that the unit be screened with vegetation, a low wooden fence around the unit, or a privacy fence around the rear yard. Staff recommends partial approval of the proposed project with conditions.

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

Mr. Rodney Williams, contractor came up to answer questions.

Mr. Dave Seibert speaking as a member of the public, came up to speak on the project.

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

Mr. Elmes made a motion to approve the application with the conditions in the staff report that they remove all non-historic architectural materials, that they retain historic wood features porches, window trim, siding, dentil moldings and corbels, that the shutters on the rear window black out exterior colors noted defer to staff, repairs front porch decking per staff report, rear porch handrail be repaired, that any replacement of wood be coordinated with staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and passed 7-0-0.

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to rehabilitate the structure to include removing asphalt siding, replacing metal windows with PVC windows, rehabilitating front and rear porches and installing mechanical equipment, and

WHEREAS, any historic features be retained and restored, and restoration work be in consultation with staff

WHEREAS, the rear window be retained and blocked out from the interior not covered with a shutter, and

WHEREAS, the rear porch rail be maintained and the replacement of any features with substitute materials be submitted to staff for 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE:	Affirmative:	Yates, McRoberts, Klaus, Elmes, Hughes, Aarons-Sydnor and Hendricks
	Negative:	None
	Abstain:	None

Application No. 15-157 (2217 Monument Ave)

2217 Monument Ave

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to demolish an existing single story addition and rear stairs and construct a new single addition on the rear of a dwelling located in the Monument Avenue Old and Historic District. Staff recommends that the applicant install an additional window on the alley elevation to reference the more design of the historic design. Staff recommends that all windows be true or simulated divided lite. Staff recommends that the applicant provides details of the proposed garage door for staff to review and administrative approval. Staff recommends approval of the conversion of the door to a window and the window to the door as these changes are on a secondary elevation and maintain the existing fenestration pattern while minimally altering the opening sizes with the conditions that the door be simulated or true divided lite. Staff recommends partial approval of this project with conditions.

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

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

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

Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the application in accordance with staff report recommendations and leave it up to DHR to deal with the second floor opening at the rear and door and that the front porch roof be simulated slate or metal seam. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they were denying the infill. Mr. Yates stated yes and defer it to DHR.

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

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct a rear addition and rehabilitated an existing garage and front porch, and

 WHEREAS, that the front porch roof n simulated slate or standing seam, and

 WHEREAS, all work shall be performed in conformance with an approved Part II Tax Credit application, and,

 WHEREAS, any additional conditions required by the Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service should be submitted to staff for review and administrative 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 30.930 of the Richmond City Code.

VOTE: Affirmative: Yates, Klaus, Elmes, Hughes, Hendricks and Aarons-Sydnor

 Negative: None

 Abstain: None

Application No. 15-150 (A. Ogburn)

613 N. 28th Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct two attached single family houses on a vacant lot in the Church Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that the front doors details/specifications be submitted for staff approval, that the mechanical units be screened with plantings, that a column be added in the center of the porch between the two doors, for a total of 5 columns, the porch steps be reduced in width and the steps and deck be painted or opaquely stained, the section of fence visible from 28th Street be painted or opaquely stained and that the colors be submitted to staff for approval.

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

Mr. Aaron Ogburn, the owner came up to answer questions.

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

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to approve the application with staff recommendations and one clarification that the front step be reduced to one bay in width for each house at the doors and that the foundation for the porch be brick piers with a wood lattice and that the crown molding be submitted for administrative approval and if there is a change from a gable vent to something else that it be administratively approved by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus and passed 5-1-0(Elmes opposed).

RESOLUTION: WHEREAS, the applicant proposes to construct two attached single-family houses, and

 WHEREAS, that the front door details/specifications be submitted to for staff approval, and

 WHEREAS, the mechanical units be screened with plantings, and

 WHEREAS, a column be added in the center of the porch between the two doors for a total of five columns, and

 WHEREAS, the porch steps be reduced in width to one bay in front of the doors, and

 WHEREAS, the porch steps and deck be painted or opaquely stained, and

 WHEREAS, the section of fence visible from 28th Street be painted or opaquely stained, and

 WHEREAS, the paint colors be submitted to staff for approval, and

 WHEREAS, the foundation of the porch be brick piers and wooden lattice, and

 WHEREAS, the crown molding be submitted to staff for review and approval, and

VOTE:	Affirmative:	Klaus, Hughes, Yates, Aarons-Sydnor and Hendricks
	Negative:	Elmes
	Abstain:	None

Conceptual Review

Application No. 15-143 (S. Krumbein)

2308 Jefferson Avenue

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request conceptual review of a new mixed use building to be constructed on an irregularly shaped lot located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff has not confirmed that the proposed work is consistent with zoning or building code requirements.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the steel cable would be painted white. Ms. Chen stated that they are in wood supports and stated that the wood would be white and the cable would be stainless steel.

Mr. Hendricks inquired how wide the building is and Ms. Chen stated that it is 20ft wide and lot is 28ft.

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

Ms. Sarah Krumbein, the owner, stated that the lot is actually 20 to 21ft wide and stated that it is 28 at the long point of the triangle. Ms. Krumbein stated that they are building from lot line to lot line on the left and right side and they have a 20ft setback as per zoning requirements in the rear yard. Ms. Krumbein stated that they didn't have windows on the sides which is why they did the jigsaw design to create as much as light as possible. Ms. Krumbein stated that they also did the paired double hung windows to create more light and stated that the bedrooms are of equal size which was the design element that went into the window layout on the front.

Mr. Yates inquired if the front window was aluminum fixed sash and inquired if they are double hung and Ms. Krumbein stated that they are double hung aluminum.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the adjacent property have windows on that elevation and stated that they are building right up against it and inquired if they are alignment their roof form to those openings so that the openings remain usable. Ms. Krumbein stated that she believes that they are boarded up because part of the building has been bricked in and stated that she will check on that.

Mr. Hughes stated that he understand about not putting windows on that side and inquired if there are windows on the other side. Ms. Krumbein stated that they are building on both lot lines and stated that as a result they are not putting windows on either side because there could be a building in the future to right of their building.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the lot line follow the community garden and Ms. Krumbein stated no and that they are encroaching on their lot.

Mr. Yates stated that on the side elevation on the east there is a darken portion and inquired if the was the existing building next door and Ms. Krumbein stated yes. Mr. Yates inquired if they are extending further back than the existing building and Ms. Krumbein stated yes.

Ms. Krumbein stated that they are doing the railing at the terrace jigsaw in some sort of aluminum to match the siding and keeping it grey for consistency.

Mr. Yates inquired if it was reviewed with zoning and Mr. Krumbein stated yes that they had a preliminary review and stated that they verbally approved the drawings.

Mr. Hendricks inquired if there was an alley access and Mr. Krumbein stated no. Mr. Hendricks inquired if they were going to egress out the back and Ms. Krumbein stated yes that was in case and stated that Mr. Woodall wants the egress option for the rear unit even though there is no access to the alley. Ms. Krumbein stated that it does allow the unit in the rear to access the back yard.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired what the yard would be and Mr. Krumbein stated that it would be fenced in with green scape and landscaped.

Mr. Elmes stated that they said the cornice details were speculative at this point and inquired what they were thinking about and Mr. Krumbein stated that they thinking of making it Hardi trim in white and a profile of the detail is on A-200. Ms. Krumbein stated that it is relatively a simple 2ft high and they will mirror each other above the store front and stated that the one on the top of the building there will be a flat white Hardi panel the for future signage and stated that they would have to come back to the Commission for that. Mr. Elmes inquired if there was a broken banding in the siding stated that he is not familiar with the shingle material and Mr. Krumbein stated that it is a regular grey shingle and they will be used only on the slopped portion of the roof.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired about the black canvas awning and Mr. Krumbein stated that it would be a white piece of Hardi for future signage and stated that the awning is actually on the rear of the building.

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

Mr. Hendricks stated that he has concerns about the connection to the adjacent building they have some trim hanging over the edge of the building and stated that he is concerned with the alignment of the cornices and stated that given the floor heights it's not feasible on the first floor storefront cornice. Mr. Hendricks stated that he is also concerned with the trash in the front. Mr. Krumbein stated that she spoke to Ms. Odell and she stated that she would like the trash door to be frosted.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is concerned because typically they see more horizontal proportions on the ground floor and more vertical on the upper floors and stated that it seems a little reversed.

Mr. Yates stated that the rendering on A-201 of the cornice and the elevations of the building don't match up with the cornice detail and stated that it looks like the upper membrane of the cornice is wider than the band of the lower part of the cornice. Mr. Yates suggested having a wider band at the top.

Mr. Elmes stated that it is regrettable that the two buildings that it is unified with are so disjointed and stated that both of the buildings especially the one on the west side of the alley had really severe bow belly in it towards the alley and stated that he don't think it's the case with this building. Mr. Elmes stated that this is slab on grade and inquired if they are going to try and get all meter based utilities underground. Mr. Krumbein stated if they can and stated that they will have some in the trash room to get things hidden as best they can. Mr. Elmes stated that he was thinking of the schematics of what will not have to change design to accommodate the utilities. Ms. Krumbein stated that in terms of the MEP's they will be able to work most of them out. Mr. Elmes stated that he don't have a really strong view of it as you will be coming down Jefferson Avenue which is

primary view shed as you are coming from Church Hill down towards downtown and stated that he would really want to see how the cornice wrapped and how the center banding unified as it goes around. Ms. Krumbein stated that it is not going to unify on that side and Mr. Elmes stated that he wants see how it is going to be handled and stated that he wants to make sure that the façade unifies itself well with the side so that it doesn't look disjointed at the corner.

Mr. Klaus stated that the fire door read more as a storefront very hard to tie to the two buildings discussed the windows 3 windows as opposed to 2 windows.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they had to have fire department connection and Ms. Krumbein stated yes that there will be one on the site.

Mr. Hughes stated that he likes the fact that it looks a little different but having the multiple doors and having one door and a big glass pane throws him off a bit and stated that he is not sure if he likes it because it's different or if he don't like it because it's different. Mr. Hughes stated that the massing on the side causes him some heartburn because of this big blank slate over there.

Mr. Elmes stated that he thinks it's the rendering which is what he was trying to point out. Ms. Krumbein stated that the entire first floor is going to be covered in green from the community garden.

Mr. Hughes stated that may be helpful to have it drawn up that way so that it don't jump out at you as much as opposed to be all blank.

Mr. Klaus stated that there is no restriction on that the garden that it has to stay a garden to their point of not wanting windows there. Mr. Elmes stated no and stated that there could be another building there which is the reason for not putting windows there. Mr. Klaus stated that as a tenant you have a beautiful garden there and stated that it would be nicer that as you drive down the street there is a window there and stated that he do understand the point. Ms. Krumbein stated that if they put a window on that side it would have to be a certain type of glass which is very expensive.

Ms. Mary, owner, stated that all the tenants have balconies or back yard access so they can see the garden.

Mr. Klaus stated that staff did bring up the five doors in the front in which three are working and 1 is affixed which can read more as a storefront. Mr. Klaus stated that he agrees that it is very hard to tie this to the two buildings that are there but to the point of more vertical windows and stated that the one the one thing that ties these two buildings together is the 3 windows in each of them. Mr. Klaus stated that maybe there is some creative thing that could tie that block together more with the three as opposed to the two.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she would suggest that when the applicant came back that it would be extremely helpful for them to have a rendered perspective from somewhere on Jefferson from the east.

Application No. 15-155 (Z. Kennedy)

3008-3012 E. Franklin Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request conceptual review of one free standing and two attached single family dwellings to be constructed on vacant lots located in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District.

Mr. Yates inquired how many lots there are between the 3 story houses proposed and the yellow house and Ms. Chen stated that there are about 3 lots between these houses and the yellow house on the hill and stated that where the silk fencing is there is a paper street and a curb cut and no street. Ms. Chen stated that this is still a City easement and stated that there were two or three houses that were proposed between the edge of the street and these lots.

Mr. Elmes stated that 30th Street extends all the way through there as well as 31st Street and Ms. Chen stated that 31st Street is where it turns to go down the hill and stated that 30th Street is paper street where the little piece of curbing is.

Mr. Hughes stated that he use to base things on the surrounding buildings and inquired how they base it around the vegetation. Mr. Elmes stated that there used to be houses there. Mr. Hughes inquired if they go back to the photos of the houses that were there and Mr. Elmes stated no because these are new construction.

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

Mr. Zach Kennedy stated that there are 4 lots separating the detached from that yellow house and stated that the yellow house is further back but it also has double the lot in length. Mr. Kennedy stated that one of their challenges they are dealing with on 3012 is a very sharp drop off so they are trying to stay in the front of that which is the beginning of why they went with a 3 story design.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that 3rd floor darker areas are vertical and inquired if only the fins of wall are angled and come out. Mr. Kennedy stated that at the bottom it come back underneath towards the bottom of the windows and stated that the windows are flat and then there is a slight grade or angle from the top of the mansard down. Mr. Kennedy stated that it is not completely straight down and that it does have a little bit of angle and stated that it does not pass the trim on each side. Mr. Kennedy stated that they are recessed in and not vertical but states that the windows are. Ms. Aarons-Sydney stated that if there is a paper alley do they have to consider public right-of-way view from the alley. Ms. Chen stated that it is not a paper alley and stated that it is a steep ravine.

Mr. Hughes inquired about how the trash was getting picked up and Mr. Kennedy stated that they get picked up out front and stated that their mechanical units will be out back on the ground in a covered wood structure.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he likes them and stated that they are clean and simple and stated that they are well proportioned and stated it doesn't fake being historic.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it is great that infill is starting here and she likes it.

Mr. Yates stated that it is different and it is not a copy and stated that it is a good temporary interpretation of the houses on Church Hill and wish them luck.

Mr. Elmes stated that the connector between the 2 looks very similar to the single house. Mr. Elmes stated that he knows the fenestration and the layout is different and stated

that there is a lot of verticality there with everything and stated that it is a consideration. Mr. Kennedy inquired what would help that and Mr. Elmes stated that they could punch windows forward on the single house. Mr. Kennedy stated that they could do a bay up the whole center similar to a bay about 90 degrees coming forward.

Mr. Hughes stated that he agrees with everything that has been said and stated that when they come back for finals have the details on the dimensions, colors and materials.

Mr. Klaus stated that they have a lot of lead way because when you drive down that hill it's hard to think that you're in Church Hill.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the area is going to turn around and hopes that this will contribute to it a lot.

Application No. 15-160 (D. Seibert)

2317 Carrington Street

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request conceptual review of one free standing single family dwellings to be constructed on vacant lot located in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. Staff has not confirmed that the proposed work is consistent with zoning or building code requirements.

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

Mr. Dave Seibert, the owner stated that he has never built a house before and stated that his goal was to build a house to live in and stated that he is building it bigger than the surrounding houses. Mr. Seibert stated that it is a double lot 40ft by 160 and stated that they are four lots facing the house lot 13ft wide by 80ft deep. Mr. Seibert stated that he wants to make the house a little bit taller because he hopes that something potentially besides apartment could be built next door so they will have an opportunity to build a taller house on that block. Mr. Seibert stated that there are a lot of Italianate houses and stated that he didn't want build the same thing that you see a lot. Mr. Seibert stated that he didn't know for sure what houses to include as inspiration and stated that for the front façade he didn't include it but stated that at 3412 E. Broad Street has the old cedar shake front gable and stated that they would start there. Mr. Seibert stated that Mr. Elmes inquired about something on the bottom left and stated that it is a covered stair case to the basement.

Mr. Elmes inquired if it was from the inside and Mr. Seibert stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if the applicant thinks it is going to be superior wall construction. Mr. Seibert stated that the plan is to do 10ft superior walls. Mr. Elmes stated that it reminded him of the 3400 house with that flown gable on the front and stated that because they have so much room to work with. Mr. Elmes stated that the proportions of the front gable to the bump out bay to the porch below and the front door are all going to be important and stated that they show up well in the rendering but when you look down on Broad at those houses some are a little more accessible than others. Mr. Elmes stated that the form is there and stated that they must tie in the detailing with the roof and gable and stated that it will be real helpful. Mr. Elmes stated that overall he likes the change in the form and stated that he needs to make sure that the choice of materials, fenestration, sizes and alignment works for the interior and exterior details.

Mr. Yates stated that he likes the fact that they did not copy a specific house in Church Hill and stated that the size of the house troubles him a bit because it's considerably bigger and wider than anything in Church Hill. Mr. Yates stated that the size is more like Barton Heights and Highland Park and stated that the gable is a little over powering and very much understated than any other Queen Anne house in Church Hill. Mr. Yates stated that the applicant should piggy back on Mr. Elmes comments and stated that they are going to have to be real careful with the detailing and overall proportions.

Mr. Hendricks stated that he is leaning more towards with Mr. Yates that the gable seems a little heavy and stated that the bay seems squished like it doesn't have the depth. Mr. Hendricks stated that they should bring out the bay and have more of a presence and stated that the roof line and the gable on the front is still a bit much or him. Mr. Hendricks stated that they could look at some other examples where that bay have a presence that is all the way up and forms the roof like Clay Street elevation that is shown or 23rd Street where the bays have a presence with their own roof that is their own thing.

Mr. Yates stated that the other 2 examples where the gable accentuate the bay and stated that in this case the gable is accentuating the entire front of the house.

Mr. Kennedy inquired if they would do a gable that is centered on that and then do a hipped roof. Mr. Hendricks stated that is other thing that was bothering him is that they have a hipped roof on the porch and all the others are gables.

Mr. Yates stated that they shouldn't do those little gable big gable and Mr. Seibert stated that he don't like that either.

Mr. Hughes stated that Mr. Hendricks is going in the same direction he is and stated that he would like to see it more going more with the Queen Anne Style.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it feels suburban because of the width and stated that she really appreciates the details and the fact that it is not a box and they have this bay. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it feels like a lot of roof and don't know if it can be mitigated by bringing in a perspective so they could understand how it is going to look. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she agrees with the suggestion of having the gable solely over the bay and bringing the bay out more and stated that they have a lot of freedom to go contemporary.

Mr. Yates inquired if they were planning on having finished space in the attic and Mr. Seibert stated that is one of the debates and stated that the drawing they have is not with finished space but finish able space. Mr. Seibert stated that they would be able to walk up the attic with the potential to add space that is why they have the windows on the side that why he wanted all the roof heights to be the same. Mr. Seibert inquired if they did a hipped roof should they bring the height up the same as the back or should he drop the back. Mr. Elmes stated that paying attention to some of the houses in Church Hill on Broad you will sort of get the rhythm with the roof lines and how they work and stated that might help because presumably at some point they will have neighbors who really want have a side elevation.

Mr. Seibert inquired what if they stick with the gable roof and do a standing seam metal roof on the front porch and stated that the would like to do it as a low profile so that he don't notice it that much. Mr. Elmes stated that he would probably do metal on that as a kicker roof because they will have to get some sort of projection there and figure out how it's all going to come together.

Klaus stated that he has a wide lot and to narrow it he will be leaving some much on the other side and will make it even more awkward and stated that when you look at the rendering where it is shown next to the house the scale looks okay. Mr. Klaus stated that he worries as well that it is suburban and looks so wide and stated that when you look at the lot it would look worse if it was narrow.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the roof don't help the verticality it's kind of squishing of it and stated that if there is a way to emphasize the verticality more it would really help and stated that if they made a smaller gable that it would help a lot.

Mr. Yates inquired what the ceiling heights are and Mr. Seibert stated that they are all 9ft ceilings. Mr. Yates stated that they might want to consider having slightly higher first floor because it might help with the proportions. Mr. Seibert stated that the front porch columns are not centered and inquired if he should center it on the window and Mr. Yates stated don't center it on the window.

Mr. Seibert stated that because of the basement Code is also going to require deep windows with ladders because there are going to be two bedrooms down there and

stated that he is going to need window wells. Mr. Seibert stated that for code purposes he is going to need two full size windows down there in case there is a fire and they can climb through the window. Mr. Siebert stated that he was he was thinking that he could do block window wells on ground level that would stick up 3 or 4 inches. Mr. Elmes inquired if the mechanicals are going to be in the basement and Mr. Seibert stated yes. Mr. Elmes stated that they might want to have a door somewhere around the back of property anyway which will serve the same purpose.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the windows are those rectangles are shown in the basement and Mr. Seibert stated that he doesn't have them on this rendering. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if they would see the head of the windows and Mr. Seibert stated only a little bit.

The meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Marianne G. Pitts

Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review