



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, February 23, 2016

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### 1 Call to Order

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

### 2 Roll Call

**Present --** 8 - \* Sanford Bond, \* Joseph Yates, \* Gerald Jason Hendricks, \* Rebecca S. Aarons-Sydnor, \* Nathan Hughes, \* James W. Klaus, \* Andrew Ray McRoberts and \* Matthew Elmes

**Absent --** 1 - \* Bryan Green

### 3 Approval of Minutes

[ID 15-012](#) November 24, 2015 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [November 24, 2015 Meeting Minutes](#)

**Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the November 24, 2015 and December 15, 2015 meeting minutes. It was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --** 8 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

[ID 15-013](#) December 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [December 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes](#)

**Mr. Yates made a motion to approve the November 24, 2015 and December 15, 2015 meeting minutes. It was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --** 8 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

### 4 Other Business

#### Secretary's Report

Ms. Pitts stated that the members have a memo from the Director of Planning in regard to the Location, Character, and Extent review of the Maggie Walker Plaza. Ms. Pitts stated that the Planning Commission has opted to have the Urban Design Committee provide a recommendation and stated that the Public Art Commission is interested in having some sort of input from the Commission of Architectural Review. Ms. Pitts stated that Ms. Sarah Driggs who is on the Public Art Commission is interested in coming to the March meeting to present some plans.

Mr. Yates stated that since this is not a formal review the Commission will be submitting a letter. Ms. Pitts stated that the Maggie Walker Plaza will be reviewed by the UDC in April.

Ms. Pitts stated that at the last meeting they had an application for 725 N. 24th Street, which was the project where the applicant wanted to paint the masonry blue. The applicant has appealed the Commission's decision, and Ms. Pitts stated that the Commission's response is going to City Council tomorrow outlining how they relied on the guidelines for their decision. Ms. Pitts stated that she met with Councilwoman Newbille to see what type of information she would like to see in terms of the Commission's response.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if there was a sponsor for the appeal, and Ms. Pitts stated no. Ms. Pitts informed the Commission of the appeal timeline which is that the applicant files the appeal within 15 days of the Commission's decision, the Commission has 15 days from the date the appeal was filed to issue a response, and City Council has 75 days from the date the appeal was filed to affirm, modify, or reverse the Commission's decision. If Council takes no action, the Commission's decision is affirmed.

Ms. Pitts stated that the applicant for another item that was at the last meeting for 823 N. 24th Street where the applicant painted the side of his building red without seeking approval has not appealed the Commission's decision. Ms. Pitts stated that the applicant is working with a contractor to determine how to best remove the painting and parging on the structure without damaging the brick. Ms. Pitts stated that she and Ms. Chen attended Councilwoman Newbille Senior Fest to provide information to any residence who live in the Old and Historic Districts of the 7th Council District. Ms. Pitts stated that another item that has come up recently are several projects that are coming back for administrative review by the chair because there are changes that are beyond the scope of what the Secretary can approve. Ms. Pitts stated that they were hoping to have a discussion about one particular item and stated that the chair and vice chair were interested in getting feedback from the Commission. Ms. Pitts stated that a lot of the changes to previously approved projects are positive but are too large in scope for the chair to feel comfortable about approving. Ms. Pitts showed the Commission members some photos of the project that was approved by the Commission at 1904 East Marshall and the change that the applicant wanted to make which was to construct a stair tower that is required for egress.

Mr. Yates inquired if the recess was there previously and stated that it is just the little pavilion on top, and Ms. Pitts stated yes and stated that portion of the building has recessed approximately 4ft and the stair towers will be on the recessed portion.

Mr. Elmes stated that it is pushed but not all the way and exists only on the Cedar Street side. The Commission came up to a consensus that the Chair could approve the project that was previously approved by the Commission. Mr. Hendricks stated that he thinks that the project should have come back to the Commission.

#### Administrative Approvals

Ms. Pitts distributed an Administrative Approval report. Staff issued 66 approvals for the period from January 27, 2016 through February 23, 2016.

#### Enforcement Report

Ms. Pitts stated that she is currently scheduled to go to court on Thursday in regards to 2001 Venable Street. Ms. Pitts stated that this is the project that has a lot of signs and

lighting that never came to the Commission.

Other Committee Reports

There were no other committee reports.

The meeting recessed at 3:47 p.m.

The meeting resumed at 4:00 p.m.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion was made by Ms. Aarons Sydnor to move item #6 for 2201 E. Franklin Street from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. Ms. Pitts stated that it is a tax credit project that would require review by DHR and stated that the approval was conditioned upon an approved Part II. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klaus.

Mr. Elmes stated that he has a lot of questions about the project.

Mr. Bond inquired if the motion included the conditions in the staff report, and Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated yes.

Mr. Hendricks stated that his concern is that it is a pretty large project.

After further discussion the motion failed 3-5-0 (Yates, Elmes, Hughes, Hendricks and McRoberts opposed).

**Mr. Bond made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda with staff's recommended conditions. It was seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye -- 8 -** Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

- 1     [CAR No. 2016-023](#)     1822 Monument Avenue - Replace asphalt and brick rear parking area with gravel and cobblestone

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

**Mr. Bond made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. It was seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried by the following vote.**

- 2     [CAR No. 2016-024](#)     2121 E. Marshall Street - Rehabilitate front porch by replacing the tin roof awith flat seam copper roofing and rebuilding the stairs

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

**Mr. Bond made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as submitted. It was seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried by the following vote.**

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 3     [CAR No. 2016-020](#)     2224 Jefferson Avenue - Construct a carport at the rear of an existing structure

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct a carport at the rear of a home in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. This application was the result of an enforcement activity as the approximately 12' by 14' wooden carport was constructed without a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. The applicant has not provided a site plan for the structure and for this reason zoning was unable to provide guidance as to whether the structure meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends denial of the project.

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

Mr. Charles Fields, representing the owner, came up to answer questions and stated that the owners were under the impression that detached structures did not require a building permit.

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

Mr. Klaus inquired if they were able to put screening wood lattice on the sides than it would be more likely to be approved, and Ms. Pitts stated that it would not meet the requirements as deck as outlined in the guidelines. Mr. Klaus inquired if it had to be on all sides, and Ms. Pitts stated that the guidelines speak to it being on all sides.

**Mr. Bond made a motion to deny this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --**    7 -    Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**No --**    1 -    Elmes

- 4     [CAR No. 2016-021](#)     506 N. 23rd Street - Construct a trellis at the rear of the property

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to construct a wooden pergola at the rear of a home in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. This application is the result of enforcement activity as the triangular structure which is abutting the existing deck was completed without obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness or a building permit. Though the trellis is located at the rear of the property, it is visible from the public right of way. The applicant has not provided a site plan for the structure and for this reason zoning was unable to provide guidance as to whether the structure meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff

recommends that the structure be painted or stained a neutral color that complements one or more of the colors found on the main structure. Staff recommends approval of the project with a condition.

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

Mr. Charlie Fields, 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 this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions in the staff report and with the condition that it be stained or painted a neutral color to complement one of the colors found in the area and color selection be deferred to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye -- 8 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes**

- 5     [CAR No. 2016-022](#)     2413 Carrington Street - Construct a new duplex with a new two story garage

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report for the applicant's request approval to construct a new duplex and garage in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The new duplex will be a two-story three bay frame dwelling with a front gable roof and full façade porch. Staff recommends approval of the project with the following conditions: the window in the front gable be replaced with a centered louver, the front door be black to match the other door, and the fence and garage stairs be painted or opaquely stained.

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

Mr. Bryan Traylor, the applicant, 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 this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented with the condition that the front gable window be proportioned similar to the one presented in the photograph on the application and dropped down, and that particular section as drawn should come back to staff for approval and final colors be deferred to staff.**

Mr. Yates stated that for clarification the trim around the windows and doors. Mr. Elmes stated that the trim and doors has been stated by the applicant which will be 1 by 4 aluminum casing which clicks into the Geld Win system and they will have bottom sills as well so they will resemble the windows in the photograph on the application more so then the ones that were drawn. Mr. Elmes stated that he disagrees with staff conditions and stated the applicant can keep his door selection or work with staff for a color.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor added a friendly amendment that the porch does not have

dentil moldings or corbels shown in the elevation and that the windows will be clear glass.

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 8 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

- 6 [CAR No. 2016-025](#) 2201 E. Franklin Street - Rehabilitate a former tobacco warehouse to include new openings and new windows, entrances, and storefront

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to rehabilitate a former tobacco warehouse in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District. The building is a four story brick warehouse built about 1890, a three story brick addition to the south built prior to 1925, and a small three story addition incorporated into the property by 1950. The applicant is pursuing rehabilitation tax credits for this project. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions that the Commissions' approval should be conditioned upon the work being performed in conformance with the Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions. In addition, the applicant should submit any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Parks Services to CAR staff for administrative review and approval.

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

Mr. James Hill, representing the owner, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Crystal Miller-Liggon, from Walter Parks Architects, 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 this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness as presented with the conditions in the staff report pursuant to the request from DHR in the Part II of the application process.**

**Mr. Bond stated that he would like to see the fire escape intact and stated that he has trouble with the doors being fixed like blinders on the outside. Mr. Elmes stated that he would accept those as a friendly amendments reverting to the fact that DHR will weigh in on both of those and the screening of the HVAC units so that they will minimize the view shed from the Franklin Street side.**

**Ms. Pitts stated that the staff report included concerns regarding changes to some openings to bring these items to the attention of the Commission and stated that staff's ultimate recommendation and conditions was to defer to DHR and require an approved Part II. Ms. Pitts stated that if they do not go forward with the tax credit process than they will have to come back to the Commission again.**

After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 8 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

- 8 [CAR No. 2016-027](#) 3420 E. Marshall Street - Rehabilitate exterior of home and enclose existing rear and side porch

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

Ms. Chen presented the staff report and summarized that the applicant's request for approval to rehabilitate the exterior of a home and enclose an existing rear and side porch in the Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District. The applicant proposes to remove the brick veneer and replace the underlying deteriorated wood siding with smooth, unbeaded Hardie lap siding. Staff recommends approval of the project with the condition that the colors be submitted to staff for review and the new metal roofing on the front porch roof be flat lock, and the standing seam roof on the main dwelling, rear extension and side and rear porch have a low, narrow seam profile. Staff commented that specifications for the new metal roof be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the panel and the cornice was existing or new, and Ms. Chen stated that they are existing and will remain and be restored.

Mr. Yates stated that he did not see anything in the staff report about the cornice and stated that it is pretty deteriorated and that it could be part of the requirement that it be restored.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if staff was pretty comfortable with the extent of the deterioration of the windows that they all can be replaced versus restoring them. Ms. Chen stated that what the Commission sees are storm windows and stated that there are a few windows in the rear that appear to be very deteriorated, and the side windows are gone.

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

Mr. Olatokunbo Oni, the owner, came up to answer questions and stated that what the Commission sees on the plans is what they are going to do.

Mr. Elmes inquired if the brick veneer that is on their now is actually brick or is it the fiber board. Mr. Oni stated that it is brick veneer. Mr. Elmes inquired if they know what the condition of the siding is like underneath and Mr. Oni stated that the siding is not in good condition and stated that they are going to put the Hardi over brick veneer and stated that the siding around the back is damaged. Mr. Elmes inquired if it was the applicant's intent to leave the siding and veneer in place and apply the Hardi plank on top of that, and Mr. Oni stated correct. Mr. Elmes inquired how they will address the window trim and the cornice details at that point because the Hardi board is going to stick pass the window trim if applied over the brick veneer and siding. Mr. Oni stated that they will use wood siding around it. Mr. Elmes inquired if the applicant was fine with staff recommendations that they get approved for the metal standing seam roof product that they are going to use, and Mr. Oni stated yes that he will bring in some samples. Mr. Elmes inquired if the steps and retaining wall are being replaced and Mr. Oni stated yes. Mr. Elmes inquired if they were keeping the same form, and Mr. Oni stated yes and stated that the only thing that will change is that they are going to be wooden steps.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the wall will have a brick cap and Mr. Oni stated yes. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor inquired if the stairs that are going through the height of the wall will be

concrete or brick, and Mr. Oni stated that it will be concrete.

Mr. Elmes stated that the application states that they propose to remove the brick veneer and replace the underlaid deteriorated wood siding with smooth and beaded Hardi plank and stated that now they want to put the Hardi plank on the outside of the brick veneer, and Mr. Oni stated yes. Mr. Elmes stated that he is not sure that is going to work out.

Mr. Yates inquired if they had a width specified for the new wood columns on the front porch, and Mr. Oni stated not right now but stated that he could give it to staff.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the front elevation appears to still show the rod iron between the columns but stated that the note says Richmond Rail and Mr. Oni stated that it is going to be Richmond rail. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that the elevation does not show any rails coming down the stairs, and Mr. Oni stated that they will have a one which will be Richmond rail.

Mr. Elmes inquired if staff recommended that the front porch roof be flat lock instead of standing seam metal because it such a low pitch and asked the applicant if they were concerned with that. Mr. Oni stated that he thinks they can leave it the same way and put a coating on top of it. Mr. Elmes inquired if the front door was existing or is it going to be changed, and Mr. Oni stated that they are going to change it because it is damaged. Mr. Elmes inquired if there was another door behind the storm door and Mr. Oni stated that it is a newer door. Mr. Elmes inquired if they are purposing the 6 panel door, and Mr. Oni stated yes.

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

Mr. Elmes stated that his preference for the exterior would be that they remove the brick veneer as the application suggests and see what the condition is of the wood siding underneath and at that point make a determination about the amount of material that needs to be replaced. Mr. Elmes stated that it would be not the best building practices to apply yet another layer of siding to the outside of the structure as it exists and then have to amend the trim in the corners around the windows, the sills and everywhere else to try to make up for that.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that in code there is limit of how many roofs you can have and inquired if that is the same for siding, and Mr. Elmes stated no. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that she is happy that this property is being renovated but stated that her concern is there are changes that the applicant described during his presentation that are different from the application and stated that she feels that there are so many that it may be difficult to approve now. Ms. Aarons-Sydnor stated that it would be better if the Commission could get an application that reflects all the changes and clarifications that were presented.

Mr. Hughes stated that will give the applicant some time for exploration of the the siding looks like underneath.

Mr. Yates stated that he has a totally different concern regarding the columns on the front porch and stated that all of the surrounding houses have turned wood columns and stated that the columns that are shown are much too wide and that the new columns need to line up with the current projecting blocks in order to look more proportional. Mr. Yates stated that he also have concerns with them applying siding over the brick veneer.

**Ms. Aarons-Sydnor made a motion to defer this Application for a Certificate of**



Appropriateness and that the applicant come back with the clarifications that were mentioned including the coating, the porch roof, showing the Richmond rail accurately, clarifying the new door, clarifying the new steps and retaining wall and investigate what is behind the brick siding and whether there is ghosting columns as mentioned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hughes.

Mr. Hendricks made an amendment that the restoration be done on the cornice.

Mr. McRoberts inquired if there is anything that the Commission would allow to be under the brick veneer that will allow them to leave it up or do we want them to remove it no matter what is under it. Mr. Elmes stated that he can't think of a condition that will work out from a practical standpoint.

Mr. Yates offered a friendly amendment that the porch columns be in proportion.

Mr. Leon Baptiste, co-owner with the applicant, stated that right now the roof is severely damaged and the weather is affecting the property and inquired if they could come to an understanding by letting them repairing or installing the new roof.

Mr. Yates stated that he does not see a problem with the applicant repairing the roof and coming back to the Commission with the other items.

Mr. Elmes stated that he does not have a problem with allowing the applicant to repair the roof with staff review and approval.

Ms. Aarons-Sydnor amended the deferral to include an approval of the main roof only.

After further discussion, the motion was re-seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried by the following vote.

Aye -- 8 - Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

- 9 [CAR No. 2016-028](#) 606 W. 19th Street - Construct a two-story rear addition, remove an existing chimney, and replace existing roof with dimensional asphalt shingles

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's requests approval to construct an addition and rehabilitate a home in the Spring Hill Old and Historic District. Staff recommends approval of the replacement of the existing rear building addition with a new 2 story addition, the proposed window replacement, painting of the structure and addition, gutter installation, and fence reinstallation with the following conditions: that the applicant install a standing metal seam roof on the proposed addition to match the existing roof on the primary structure and the existing porches, that the applicant install the wood siding of the same reveal as the primary structure on the proposed addition and the applicant provide details on the proposed gutter installation for staff to review and administratively approve. Staff recommends denial of the replacement of the existing standing seam metal roof of the home with grey, dimensional asphalt shingles and denial of the removal the visible portion of the

nonfunctioning chimney.

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

Ms. Janice Lovejoy and Steve Lovejoy, the owners, came up to answer questions.

Mr. Yates stated that there was a letter in support of the project.

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

**Mr. Yates made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the owners explore elastometric products that was suggested and make a change to the staff's report and recommended that the rear chimney be removed and that the new siding will match the existing siding and that the applicant retain the gutter. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye -- 8 -** Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Aarons-Sydnor, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

- 10** [CAR No. 2016-029](#) 100 E. Franklin Street - Modify existing window openings and install two projecting signs

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to convert an existing window opening to a door opening and install two projecting signs on North 1st Street elevation of the Linden Row Inn. The applicant is proposing to remove the brick beneath the existing sill to the inside floor level and install a full lite wood door in the opening. The applicant is also proposing to install a 2' by 3' projecting metal hanging sign above the proposed new opening. Staff recommends partial approval of the project. Staff has concerns about the visual clutter created by collocating the second projecting blade sign adjacent to the existing awning and wall sign which will work to detract from the architecture of the facade. Staff suggested that the Commission may wish to consider if a corner location may be more appropriate for the proposed sign.

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

Mr. Todd Dykshorn, representing the owner, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Danielle Worthing from the Historic Richmond Foundation came up to speak for the project.

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

**Mr. Hendricks made a motion to partially approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness based on the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bond and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye -- 6 -** Bond, Yates, Hendricks, Hughes, Klaus and McRoberts

**No -- 1 -** Elmes

Excused -- 1 - Aarons-Sydnor

- 11 [CAR No. 2016-030](#) 722-724 N. 23rd Street - Modify previously approved plans for the construction of a new mixed-use development to include changes to the fenestration

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request approval to modify previously approved plans for a mixed use project on vacant parcels at the convergence of North 23rd and Jessamine Street in the Union Hill Old and Historic District. The proposed changes to the previously approved plans are as follows:

- On the east elevation, the double storefront doors which were centered in the recessed opening have been changed to a single door and a larger area a storefront glazing.

- On the south elevation, the approved plans included two sets of paired windows on the second and third floors. The applicant is now proposing four individual ranked windows on the second and third floors.

- On the west elevation, the approved plans included storefront glazing for all three stories of the recessed center bay. The applicant is proposing to replace the glazing on the second and third floors with brick and a single window on each floor. Also, the approved plans include evenly spaced ranked windows on the second and third floors of the brick portions of this elevation. The applicant is proposing to relocate the three bays of windows on the northern end of this elevation to result in ranked windows which are no longer evenly spaced. Additionally, the applicant has added one window to the first floor.

Staff recommends partial approval of the project with conditions.

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

Ms. Pitts stated that there are 2 letters of concern about this project.

Mr. Matt Jarreau, representing the owner, came up to answer questions.

Ms. Nancy Lambert, speaking as a member of the public, came up to express her concerns about the new modifications.

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

**Mr. Bond made a motion to approve this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with staff's recommended conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yates and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --** 6 - Bond, Yates, Hughes, Klaus, McRoberts and Elmes

**No --** 1 - Hendricks

**Excused --** 1 - Aarons-Sydnor

- 7     [CAR No.  
2016-026](#)     2705 E. Franklin Street - Install front doors to create an entrance vestibule

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

Ms. Pitts presented the staff report and summarized the applicant's request for approval to install paired doors at the front of a home in the St. John's Church Old and Historic District to create an entrance vestibule. The applicant is proposing to install two wooden doors with single lites to match the existing front doors of the home. Staff was unable to view physical evidence of doors and transoms at this location. As staff is unable to confirm the previous existence of these proposed doors, staff cannot recommend approval of the alteration to this primary entrance. Staff recommends denial of the project.

Mr. Klaus inquired if the flooring indicates a door being there, and Ms. Chen stated that the front entry of her home in the St. John's Church OHD looks the same and stated that it never had an interior set of doors.

Mr. Yates stated that there are no indications that there was a transom or hinges or bolt in the floor.

Mr. Yates 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.

Mr. Yates made a motion to deny the application because there is no physical evidence that a door was there. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Elmes stated that the people that are living in this house is new to the area and stated that he would be more inclined to defer the project to give the applicant more time to look for photographic evidence.

Mr. Klaus stated that they are not 100 percent that there were or were not doors there and supports giving the applicant the opportunity to look for photographic evidence.

Mr. Yates withdrew his motion.

**Mr. Elmes made a motion to defer this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness in order to give the applicant an opportunity to defend their position that a door was once there.**

**Mr. Yates made an amendment to say that they need to provide physical pictorial evidence that there was a door at this residence.**

**After further discussion the motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and carried by the following vote.**

**Aye --**    5 -    Yates, Hendricks, Hughes, Klaus and Elmes

**Excused --**    2 -    Aarons-Sydnor and McRoberts

Abstain -- 1 - Bond

## Adjournment

Mr. Yates adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.