



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes - Final Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, February 26, 2019

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### Call to Order

James Klaus, the Chairman, called the January 22nd meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:31 pm.

### Roll Call

- Present --** 8 - \* Commissioner Sanford Bond, \* Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, \* Commissioner James W. Klaus, \* Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., \* Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, \* Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, \* Commissioner Sean Wheeler and \* Commissioner Lawrence Pearson
- Absent --** 1 - \* Commissioner David C. Cooley

### Approval of Minutes

December 18, 2018

Commissioner Klaus pointed out a correction to be made: the vote tally for the 6th item, in the consent agenda, were missing. Ms. Carey Jones stated that staff would correct this omission.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, Jr., seconded by Commissioner Bond, that the December 17, 2018 Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

January 15, 2019 (Quarterly Meeting)

January 22, 2019

### Review of National Register Nominations

[NHR 2019 1](#) Deep Run Hunt Club

**Attachments:** [Deep Run Hunt Club](#)  
[Deep Run Hunt Club Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones stated that the Deep Run Hunt Club is located at the end of Avondale Avenue in the Rosedale neighborhood near the Laburnum Avenue entrance ramp to Route 64. It is not currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The nomination states

that The Deep Run Hunt Club is eligible for listing under Criteria A and C, with a period of significance of 1896-1910. Under Criterion A it is eligible in the areas of entertainment and recreation for its association with the Deep Run Hunt Club, a popular and prosperous social organization in Virginia from 1896 to 1910. In 1894, Major Lewis Ginter purchased the property and provided it to the hunt club in order to expand their social and recreational activities. The property is also eligible under Criterion C in the area of architecture. In 1895 Lewis Ginter hired Richmond architect D. Wiley Anderson to remodel and enlarge the original four-room brick farmhouse. Anderson added both Queen Anne Victorian and Colonial Revival stylistic elements to the original early 1800's building. This was Anderson's first major project in the developing Northside suburbs and highlights his stylistic range and ability to design in two popular styles of the time. Ms. Jones stated staff recommendation that the Commission support the listing of this property in the State and National Historic Registers, under National Register Criteria A and C with a period of significance from 1896 to 1910. Chairman Klaus requested comment from the Commissioners, reminding them that Commission's role on DHR recommendations is merely advisory.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to recommend support for the National Register Nomination for Deep Run Hunt Club. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

## [NHR 2019 2](#) Manchester Trucking Historic District

**Attachments:** [Manchester Trucking and Commercial Historic District](#)  
[Manchester Trucking Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones stated that the proposed Manchester Trucking and Commercial Historic District encompasses roughly 50 acres and portions of four urban blocks. The district is situated along both sides of Commerce Road generally between Dinwiddie and Ingram Avenues. Because many of the properties in the historic district were purpose-built to serve the motor vehicle shipping industry, the area is characterized by commercial and industrial buildings, some of which are fairly large in order to accommodate large quantities of goods for distribution.

Architecturally, the buildings are generally utilitarian in design, with warehouses featuring multiple loading bays and docks and office buildings. Many of the buildings are set on large paved or graveled properties left open to accommodate tractor-trailer circulation, where the trucking fleets could park, load/unload, or be serviced. The property is not currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The nomination states that the proposed Manchester Trucking and Commercial Historic District is eligible for listing in the State and National Registers under Criterion A for its representation of important evolutionary trends in Richmond's trucking and motor freight industry during the mid-twentieth century as well as its intact collection of buildings and structures that convey the area's function as a trucking and distribution center. As such, it qualifies for listing at the local level in the area of Commerce and Transportation with a period of significance ranging from 1947-1968. The period of significance begins with the construction of the Acme Fixture factory, the first building constructed in the district, and ends in 1968, coinciding with the fifty-year threshold for NRHP eligibility, as the important associations of the district to the trucking industry continue. The buildings in the district

remain in fair to good condition with a moderate to high retention of historical integrity. In early February staff reviewed the nomination and on February 5 met with representatives from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

During the meeting staff expressed concerns with the content of the nomination and the proposed boundaries. Specifically staff identified sections of the nomination where buildings are associated with individual business that utilized the surrounding transportation network versus those that were transportation-related businesses which constructed purpose-built buildings to support this industry. Staff recommended removing a number of properties from the nomination, mostly because they were not built to serve the shipping and motor freight industry. These properties are: 1003 Commerce Road (1947), Acme Fixture Company; 1005 Commerce Road (1947) OK Foundry Company; 1011 Commerce Road (1947) W T Holt warehouse, which is listed as non-contributing in the nomination; 906-1000 Dinwiddie (1960) Topcrafters, manufacturers of wood, plastics and cabinetry, and the large parking lot at 710 Commerce Road.

Removing these properties would result in a new boundary that ends at Gordon Avenue and a revised period of significance of 1954-1968. Staff also recommended that the nomination include a comparative analysis of the buildings in the proposed district with other buildings identified in the nomination form, that the nomination form include a discussion that strengthens the connection between this area and the major transportation corridors of Route 360 (not 460 as mentioned in the nomination form), Route 1, and Interstate 95, and the nomination authors add an explanation of improvements to Commerce Road during this time and how it relates to the transportation industry in Richmond. Staff also suggested the buildings are not International Style as identified in the nomination and that Stripped Classicism might be more appropriate.

Ms. Jones stated staff recommendation that the boundary of the proposed Manchester Trucking and Commercial Historic District include three properties on either side of Commerce Road between Gordon Avenue and Ingram Avenue: Overnite Transportation/Estes Express (1959), 1100 Commerce Road; Blue and Grey Transportation Company (1959), 1111 Commerce Road; and the Richmond Container Corporation (1954), 1125 Commerce Road. Staff also recommends a period of significance from 1954, starting with the earliest building in the revised boundary, and ending in 1968, the standard 50-year threshold for NRHP-eligibility.

Chairman Klaus asked why the proposed district boundary contains a parking lot. Ms. Jones stated that this is the large area which staff recommended be removed from the nomination. Ms. Jones stated that staff had asked DHR about the inclusion of the parking lot; their response was that the lot is part of the historic utilization of the trucking industry in that area.

Commissioner Morgan recused herself from discussion of the proposed historic district.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Andrew Basham of Spy Rock Development stated that Spy Rock owns nearby property at the corner of Ingram and Commerce. Mr. Basham stated that Spy Rock has been working on this historic district proposal for two years, having had several meetings with DHR, but that he only found out about the CAR meeting advisory discussion three hours before the meeting. Mr. Basham stated that DHR approved their nomination twice for this historic district. Spy Rock has also met with the Planning Director and the City Council person for this district, and held a public meeting. Mr. Basham stated that meeting feedback and all letters received about the proposal have been supportive. Mr. Basham

stated that the boundary as depicted in staff presentation is inaccurate, and the parking lot area has in fact been removed from the proposed district. He stated that Rob Taylor of Dutton Associates has been Spy Rock's consultant on this proposal, but that he was out of town at time of meeting and unable to attend, as was Mark Wagner of DHR. Mr. Basham stated that the buildings of the district in question are interesting mid-century structures reflective of the industry for which they were built, which is an important part of Richmond's history: the abandonment of rail and the adoption of trucking for freight.

Mr. Basham stated that the historic district approval process is in need of some improvement, which he believes DHR is working on. This would include proposals coming before the Commission earlier.

Catherine Easterling, a tax credit consultant with the architecture firm Sadler & Whitehead, stated that they are working with some property owners within the proposed district. Sadler and Whitehead would support the adoption of the district with the boundaries as described by Mr. Basham. Ms. Easterling stated that Sadler & Whitehead feel that the property at 1003 Commerce Road, which staff proposes to eliminate from the district, does contribute to the district; and that feedback from the National Park Service indicates they agree. Ms. Easterling stated that the 1003 Commerce Road property is similar in massing, style, scale, and construction techniques as many other buildings in the district, and is the oldest. She stated that signage was found in the interior indicating that shipping equipment was produced in this building, which supports the idea of including it in the district.

Chairman Klaus stated that this situation has occurred before: a seemingly homogeneous group of buildings, some of which are a fit for historic district nomination and some of which arguably are not, and suggested that, for buildings to be included in the proposed district, evidence should be provided of their historic links to trucking and shipping. Without supporting documentation, the Commission is unable to make a determination about those buildings which have no obvious thematic connection to the district.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to recommend support for the National Register Nomination for Manchester Trucking Historic District. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

## **Other Business**

### **Secretary's Report**

Commission Secretary Carey Jones reported that in the past month, staff has responded to a number of inquiries about who is on staff and what their responsibilities are, and what the deadlines are for the meeting. Aside from the Secretary, Ms. Jones, there are three full-time staff who divide their time among Commission responsibilities and other departmental activities, including the Urban Design Committee. Those people are Chelsea Jeffries, Alex Dandridge, and Matt Everett.

Aside from monthly meetings, planning staff work together – Ms. Jones, Ms. Jeffries, and

Ms. Kim Chen – to determine if applications can be administratively approved or must go before the Commission. Staff then process administrative approvals (average of 14 per month); review and approve building permits (average of 82 per month); conduct enforcement activities, which involves some site visits and meetings with owners; prepare the meeting minutes (one of Administrative Support Assistant Matt Everett's main responsibilities); and provide public outreach and technical support to property owners and potential owners. Both phone inquiries and in-person "pop-ins" are a significant portion of the work day. Commission staff also prepare public notices – an average of 440 per meeting.

Staff receive many inquiries about the CAR meeting calendar. Ms. Jones distributed copies to the Commission of the CAR staff calendar of meetings, pointing out that the meetings are on a four-week cycle, with a set of steps and deadlines which staff must follow in order to maintain that schedule. The calendar helps staff to provide a high level of customer service to applicants, while hopefully providing the Commission sufficient time to review applications and for the public to add their own input. The calendar is not yet on the website, though it is hoped that posting and updating such items will become quicker and easier after the website redesign currently underway.

Staff are required by ordinance to send out public notices about specific types of projects – most of the ones the Commission reviews – and these are mailed to the addresses of all property owners whose buildings are within 150 feet of proposed project sites. Notices are also printed in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on the Sunday before the full week before the monthly Tuesday meeting. Ms. Jones recommends to applicants that they also inform their neighbors personally. There are two deadline dates for applicants: the Friday after the meeting for new applications; and the Monday of second week in the calendar for revised applications from those applicants who have already undergone conceptual review.

Commission staff review applications, often following up with applicants for further information, before making a final draft of the meeting agenda, which is uploaded into three separate databases. Staff then draft staff reports for each application – these are written individually and then reviewed and revised by staff at a group meeting. Staff also field and collect public comment on applications, ideally by the Monday before the meeting, so that Commission staff can read it along with application materials.

Staff finds that they still need additional information when building permits are submitted and are going to start requesting this information as a condition of approval. Related to this, Ms. Jones met recently with the zoning staff to address concerns they have regarding preliminary review of CAR projects which zoning staff performs. CAR staff typically request the zoning staff review plans for new construction, additions, etc. Zoning staff expressed concerns about not having enough information to complete their reviews, and their review being seen as an official approval, which it is not. Zoning staff agreed to start providing Commission staff with the additional information they need, and Commission staff will start including this as a condition of approval. The Commission might therefore start seeing more zoning information in the approval conditions. Commission staff is hopeful that this will help expedite reviews of applications and permits.

Public Outreach: Staff is aware of two significant properties that are for sale: St Paul's Church in Church Hill, and 4104 Hermitage Road in the Hermitage Road Historic District. Staff has been in contact with the realtors for both of these properties and has provided information about the CAR review process, historic tax credits, and other city processes including permitting and special use permits; staff has also spoken with potential buyers

and provided information to them about the Commission and our review process,

Chairman Klaus asked if this contact with owners was a new procedure, or if it was something staff has done before. Ms. Jones stated that she has begun to do this with larger properties, as owners in enforcement situations often state that they did not know about the Guidelines. Ms. Jones stated that significant property sales come to her notice by various means, including social media. Chairman Klaus stated that Commission members could assist by bringing them to her attention when they are aware of them.

Staff responded to a complaint about the acoustics in the meeting room. Staff worked with IT staff to fix the sound system. Hopefully this will result in better acoustics for members of the public. On that note, staff requests that Commission members speak loudly, clearly, and one at a time.

#### Administrative Approvals

There was no discussion of administrative approvals.

#### Enforcement Report

Staff have received several complaints about 617 W 29th Street in the Springhill neighborhood. Ms. Kim Chen and Ms. Jones have met with the owner three times to address concerns about the building foundation and first floor height. Staff has requested an application from the owner to address the discrepancy in building height between what was approved by the Commission and what is currently being built. There is a stop-work order and a notice of violation in effect.

Staff continues to follow up on violations for fences in Jackson Ward, a window replacement on East Franklin Street, and a newly reported porch violation on West Grace Street. Staff anticipates applications for each of these violations.

#### Other Committee Reports

Chairman Klaus stated that, going forward, he will, with Ms. Jones' assistance, share the agenda of upcoming Urban Design Committee items with Commission members, and solicit feedback to then bring to the UDC meeting. Mr. Klaus believes this will be much more useful than providing a recap of the UDC meeting just past, as he has previously done.

#### \*\*\*Please Note\*\*\*

**Public comment on cases brought before the CAR will be heard after the applicant's explanatory remarks of the case and before CAR deliberation. Applicants and individuals wishing to comment on specific aspects of a given case are asked to briefly address issues related to the application.**

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

The Chairman invited the Commission to suggest projects that they would like to move from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. He explained to the applicants present that, if they did not wish for their applications to be placed on the consent agenda, they would have an opportunity to have it moved back to the regular agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, with Commissioner Klaus seconding,

to move the 5th item, COA-048375-2019, 512 West 19th Street, and the 6th item, COA-048376-2019, 602 West 19th Street, to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 3rd item, COA-049226-2019, 2230 Venable Street, to the consent agenda. The Commission approved the item with all in favor except Commissioner Lane Pearson and Commissioner Sean Wheeler abstaining.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 14th item, COA-047063-2019, 401 North Allen Street to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 8th item, COA-048388-2019, 2711 East Broad Street to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 9th item, COA-049218-2019, 312 North 32nd Street, to the consent agenda. The Commission approved the item with all in favor except Commissioner Lane Pearson and Commissioner Sanford Bond abstaining.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 11th item, COA-049214-2019, 802 North 22nd Street to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 10th item, COA-049220-2019, 813 North 28th Street to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Wheeler seconding, to move the 12th item, COA-048392-2019, 200 West Marshall Street to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, with Commissioner Pearson seconding, to move the 18th item, COA-049230-2019, 1137 West Grace Street to the consent agenda. Chairman Klaus stated his concern that the change from 2/2 to 1/1, for about 300 windows, constitutes a major change to the design. The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye – 3 – Commissioner Kathleen Morgan Commissioner Sanford Bond, and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson,

No – 4 – Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Neville Johnson, and

Abstaining – 1 – Commissioner Sean Wheeler

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to move item 2, 604 Saint James Street, from the consent agenda to the regular agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 6 – Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner

Sanford Bond, and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

No – 1 Commissioner Lane Pearson

Abstaining – 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment concerning the items on the consent agenda.

Jill Nolt requested confirmation in regard to the item number 14, 401 North Allan, since this proposal includes two options. Chairman Klaus affirmed that approval of this item would mean approval of both options.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 1 [COA-048378-2019](#) 3317 Monument Avenue - Construct a new, brick patio.

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the installation of a brick patio is approved, but not the work shown on the elevations. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 3 [COA-049226-2019](#) 2230 Venable Street - Revise approved plans to modify window design.

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following condition is met: any additional project changes are coordinated with staff. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson



- 5 [COA-048375-2019](#) 512 West 19th Street - Construct a new, single-car garage.

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report.**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 6 [COA-048376-2019](#) 602 West 19th Street - Expand an existing, detached garage.

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 8 [COA-048388-2019](#) 2711 East Broad Street - Construct a new accessory dwelling unit.

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following condition is met: the final window specifications including materials be submitted for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 10 [COA-049220-2019](#) 813 North 28th Street - Revise previously approved design to consider exterior details.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following condition is met: the decorative fence and other site improvements be submitted for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**11** [COA-049214-2019](#) 802 North 22nd Street - Construct a new, single-family residence.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the fenestration on the left side elevation be reconfigured to include vertically aligned windows on both stories of the visible bays, the applicant confirm with staff the presence and style of a right side window prior to applying for a building permit, the rear porch railing utilize a Richmond Rail design and that it be painted or opaquely stained a neutral or dark color, the applicant submit additional information about the rubber roof shingle product, and the window materials and proposed exterior colors be submitted for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**9** [COA-049218-2019](#) 312 North 32nd Street - Construct a new, single-family residence.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following condition is met: the applicant submit the details of the proposed fence for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 12 [COA-048392-2019](#) 200 West Marshall Street - Modify two exterior entrances, install exterior lighting, remove awnings.

**Attachments:** [Site Map](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the applicant submit specifications for the hinges for administrative review and approval, the doors be installed in a manner that does not damage the historic doorway so that should they be removed in future the material integrity will not be diminished, the applicant submit details of the lighting design including design, materials, and locations for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 14 [COA-047063-2019](#) 401 North Allen Avenue - Site improvements to front and rear yards.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans \(1/22/2019\)](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report \(1/22/2019\)](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 2 [COA-048411-2019](#) 604 St. James Street - Rehabilitate an existing building.

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

Commissioner Morgan recused herself from reviewing this application.

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Ms. Jones stated that staff recommendation was for partial approval. Staff recommended denial of the proposed storefront windows. Staff further recommended windows be approved with the condition that the applicant submit dimensioned existing elevations and specifications for new windows to staff for review and approval. Staff recommended that the applicant submit the Part II application and approval letters, and any additional conditions imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and/or the National Park Service, to staff for review and approval; and that the applicant submit a site plan with the location of the proposed HVAC system.

Mr. Bruce Shirley, architect for the project, stated that the Virginia Department of Historic Resources [DHR] typically prefers that large window openings be storefront windows, but that there is no problem with changing the design as per staff suggestions. Mr. Shirley stated that the project has been under consideration by DHR for six weeks, which is delaying building permits. Chairman Klaus stated that he had met with the applicant earlier in the day and had told her that usually by this point Commission would have the DHR report, which would make the CAR review a faster process; lacking that, Commission will proceed with its own recommendations as if this were not a DHR project.

Chairman Klaus stated that the Commission does not look kindly on applicants filling in window openings before receiving permits. Mr. Shirley stated that this was done under the contractor's own initiative, and that he would understand if Commission required them to be reopened and redone.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for a Commission motion and discussion.

Chairman Klaus asked if the garage door window were included in staff recommendations regarding windows.

Ms. Jones stated that this was one of the windows about which more information was desired.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he was okay with the storefront window as shown in plans, stating that glass garage doors are inefficient and difficult to seal; and that he recommended the 2nd floor north and west windows remain open, not bricked in.

Based on Commission discussion, Chairman Klaus stated a friendly amendment to the effect that storefront windows could be allowed; that other staff recommendations be retained; and an additional condition that windows on the north and west side be reopened. Commissioner Hendricks added that location of trash receptacles should be provided, as it is a tight site.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the bricked-in windows on plan north and west be re-opened; the applicant submit dimensioned existing and proposed elevations and**

specifications for new windows to staff for review and approval; the applicant submit the Part II application and approval letters from DHR and the NPS and any additional conditions imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and/or the National Park Service to staff for review and approval; and the applicant submit a site plan with the location of the proposed HVAC system and trash receptacles. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**4** [COA-049224-2019](#) 2113 M Street - Reconstruct front porch.

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

Ms. Chelsea Jeffries presented this application.

Ms Jeffries explained that the Commission approved the request to rehabilitate the home on September 26, 2017. At the meeting, the applicant proposed the same front porch design as currently proposed. The Commission denied the front porch design and instead approved the reconstruction of the porch with the condition that the porch be reconstructed per a 1940s picture to include turned posts, sawn brackets, high wooden piers, a landing, and stairs that run east parallel to the façade, the revised porch design to be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. Since this approval the applicant has returned to the staff and has received administrative approvals for other work on the property including the exterior siding and the fence. The applicant had not contacted staff regarding the front porch design but submitted a building permit application for the design that was denied by the Commission.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed porch reconstruction, with the following conditions: that the porch be reconstructed per the photographic evidence to include turned posts, cutout railings, sawn brackets, high wooden piers, a landing, and stairs that run west into the side yard, as they did prior to the porch's collapse; that the brick be removed from the concrete pad and the retaining wall and front steps be returned to their original appearance, a low concrete wall and concrete steps; and that the new window opening be removed and the west elevation be returned to its historic appearance.

Commissioner Morgan asked if the concrete pad and CMU retaining wall are being considered historic. Ms. Jeffries stated that they are not, and explained that on the right-hand side of the property there is a different small concrete wall which is historic, being visible in photos from the 1940s.

Mark Anderson, the owner of the property, introduced himself and stated that he has been conscientious in checking in with staff during work on the property. He stated that a brick herringbone pattern patio was part of the submitted 2017 design, and thus he believed that the brick addition to the concrete pad had been approved. Mr. Anderson also stated that he did receive a building permit to do front porch work, which led him to assume he had CAR approval for the work; and that he has communicated extensively

with the community, with Zoning staff, and with CAR staff about planned work on his property.

Mr. Anderson stated the porch collapse, which was caused by a storm, caused the nearby cement wall to fracture, so it had to be removed for safety. Mr. Anderson then installed a brick retaining wall based on nearby properties with similar walls.

Mr. Anderson produced a petition signed by 20 of his neighbors in support of the changes he has made to his property. He stated that he would prefer not to remove the brick that he has already put in place, and that the new window opening on the west elevation is minimally visible.

Commissioner Morgan asked about the front stairs as recommended by staff. Mr. Anderson stated that there is not enough room to put the stairs in place going east as per staff's recommendation. Mr. Anderson stated that he put brick on top of the existing concrete slab in order to bring the height up to conform to modern code requirements. Commissioner Hendricks asked what rise and run the steps currently have, to which Mr. Anderson stated he believed it to be 8 ¼ inches rise, with a 9 inch or less run. He made the steps as narrow as possible in order to achieve the necessary 36 inches of height and remain in code, with the stairs not impinging the sidewalk. Mr. Anderson's engineer told him that it was not safe to do the stairs that way, and that they would need a railing.

Mr. Anderson stated that there was no feasible way to have the 3-foot landing on both ends, as required by code.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the applicant had considered extending the landing at the top, past the side of the house, to the west. Mr. Anderson stated that he had not considered this option, but that it would have entailed extending the staircase three feet past the end of the house.

Commissioner Pearson asked for an explanation of the window added at the west elevation. Mr. Anderson stated that this was for a bathroom. For reasons of plumbing, it was impossible to put the window on the south side of the house. Mr. Anderson stated that there used to be a window at that location, and that he has this window in his possession.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he would like there to be a stair to the upper level of the house, as there has historically been one. He asked if Mr. Anderson had considered lowering the upper landing by 8 inches.

Ms. Jeffries explained that the door had been previously approved on the condition that a privacy fence be installed on the side. Chairman Klaus asked which of the door designs was more historic. Mr. Anderson stated that there had not been a door before, that it had been a covered porch.

Commissioner Hendricks asked if the Commission would be amenable to the stairs wrapping, to run down the west elevation.

Mr. Anderson stated he does not believe the house had stairs originally, as all other construction is mortise and tenon, whereas the porch is scabbed with machine-cut nails.

Commissioner Wheeler asked how much space is between the west elevation and the alley, as site plan does not indicate. Mr. Anderson stated that it varies from 30 feet, going off at an angle, and that there are enough steps to go west.

Ms. Jeffries stated that one public comment letter had been received about this application.

Commissioner Klaus asked if there was public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission discussion and a motion.

Chairman Klaus stated his concern that an historically appropriate design might not get zoning approval, and that Commission's ruling should take this into account. Likewise, if the front stairwell can be installed in a fashion that satisfies staff recommendation and code, then applicant should do so; if not, he should use 2017 design as a fallback. Commissioner Hendricks suggested a wraparound stair design. Chairman Klaus stated that this idea was inadvisable as being non-historic.

Chairman Klaus stated that the non-original 4-foot retaining wall that was removed should not be replaced; and that the herringbone brick pattern, if it can be shown to have been approved in previous application, should be allowed.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he would allow the side window, as well as the herringbone brick pattern.

Commissioner Morgan stated that if the porch is to be redone as per 2017 design, then it should also include Richmond Rail.

Chairman Klaus pointed out to applicant that he was being given options for how to do the stairs, and that whichever design worked for both code and Commission staff, he should get administratively approved at a later time.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Morgan, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the porch be reconstructed per the photographic evidence and include turned posts, Richmond Rail railings, sawn brackets, high wooden piers, a landing, and stairs that run west into the side yard, as they did prior to the porch's collapse. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson
- No --** 2 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr. and Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

**7**     [COA-048385-2019](#)     2007 Cedar Street - Construct a new, multi-family residence.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones stated that the Commission reviewed this application at the December 18, 2018 meeting. During the meeting, the Commission expressed concern about the main entrance being located on the side alley, the overall lot coverage, and the height and/or mass of the building. The Commission recommended reducing or breaking up the height of the building, reorienting the entrance to face Cedar Street, and reducing the use of HardiPlank for a modern design. The Commission recommended ways to break up the

height of the third floor, including setbacks and/or a mansard.

Staff recommended approval of the application, with the following conditions: that the applicant consider breaking up the massing of the third story Cedar Street elevation. Staff suggests the applicant consider a false mansard roof on the third floor, while maintaining the balcony, and consider converting the paired window into an articulated dormer window. Further conditions suggested by staff are: that the applicant consider ways to further emphasize the front entrance; that the side elevation awnings be inset between the two building masses to deemphasize this entrance; and that final window specifications be submitted for staff review and approval.

The applicant, property owner Zack Kennedy, stated that design changes have been made so the front entry reads more clearly as such, and that the house has been narrowed to allow for an alley sidewalk, which will be installed in response to safety concerns about the alley entrance. He stated that zoning allows for 35 feet, which the proposed residence will be just under, while being 3.5 feet taller than the highest point of neighboring buildings. Some off-street parking is provided in the proposed design. Mr. Kennedy stated that any other main entrance than the one at the alley would be difficult at this site.

Mr. Kennedy stated that white was chosen for the 3rd floor to offset the height. Chairman Klaus asked for clarification about height. Mr. Kennedy stated that the highest nearby property is approximately 30 feet, and that the proposed structure, at grade, would be 33 feet; and that dirt would be removed to offset the hill.

Commissioner Hendricks stated concern about the main entrance being in the alley, and suggested flipping the entire design mirror-wise so that the primary entrance could be on M Street. Commissioner Morgan stated that the Guidelines do support the siting of buildings such that they are oriented toward the primary street.

Chairman Klaus asked if the applicant would be amenable to making the third floor more of a slanting mansard, to alleviate community concerns about scale. Mr. Kennedy stated that he would be amenable, though it would not be his preference.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Anne Wortham stated that Union Hill has an especially unique character which it is important to preserve. She stated that Old and Historic District guidelines apply regardless of any underlying zoning.

Nancy Lampert stated that the Commission has been charged by the public to protect the unique character. Ms. Lampert stated her belief that the proposed construction's height, massing, and side entrance are not compatible with the district. She also questioned the proposed use of aluminum siding for the 3rd floor.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission discussion and motions.

Commissioner Wheeler made a motion to approve the application as submitted. There was no second of this motion.

Commissioner Pearson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve with staff conditions.

Commissioner Brewer stated that public comment, Commission discussion, and staff report all showed much concern about the side entrance.



Commissioner Morgan stated her concern about the height and the front setback, despite the setback having been increased by about two feet. She also expressed reservations about redesigning by committee the 3rd floor to a false mansard. Commissioner Hendricks stated his continuing reservations about the side entrance.

The motion to approve with conditions failed, with all opposed except Commissioner Bond.

Commissioner Morgan stated that several letters opposing the project were received, and to her knowledge none in favor.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the primary entrance on a primary street does not preclude having an additional entrance; but the primary must read as primary. Mr. Kennedy expressed concern that reconfiguring entrances would reduce living space.

Commissioner Wheeler questioned what makes a primary entrance primary. Commissioner Morgan pointed out that a primary entrance need not be elaborate. Commissioner Hendricks spoke in favor of primary entrance cues such as a porch, a larger door, awnings, et cetera; and stated that the side entrance, and thus the side awning, are not necessary.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be denied for reasons cited in the staff report and requested the applicant revise the plans to reorient the main entrance to the Cedar Street elevation and to minimize the massing of the third story. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**No --** 1 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler

- 13** [COA-049222-2019](#) 2617 East Grace Street - Convert first-floor windows into doorways, and a new second-floor enclosure.

**Attachments:** [Site Map](#)  
[Grace E 2617 Application and Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

Commissioner Morgan recused herself from review of this item.

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Ms. Jones stated that the application under review is partially the result of an enforcement action. In November of 2017 staff observed work being done at the property, including demolition of the rear porch, and contacted the contractors. In December 2018 staff again observed work being performed at this location and contacted the contractor. The contractor then provided staff with Part II tax credit approvals from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources for staff review and approval. In late December 2018 staff informed the contractor that they could not administratively approve the project since it includes expanding an existing window opening to accommodate a door. In early January 2019 staff met with the contractor and tax credit consultants to review the

materials required for an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff also spoke with the contractor to address building code requirements for the entry steps.

Staff recommended partial approval with the following conditions: the color of the siding be in keeping with the Commission paint palette and be submitted to staff for review and approval; and any future changes imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. Staff recommended denial of increasing the opening on the front elevation.

Ms. Jones stated that DHR has approved the changing of a window into a door. She also stated that the property has gone through various owners and contractors, which has delayed addressing the enforcement and permissions issues.

Ms. Morgan recused herself from reviewing this application.

Contractor Matt Elmes stated that he has come to this project late in the process, with current conditions already in place, but has since worked to ensure that all work done could be approved by DHR.

Mr. Elmes stated that soils have built up over time around the building, which precludes putting stairs in front, as the door will have only a 4-inch drop. Mr. Elmes stated that the reason for the door conversion was to make an entry to otherwise inaccessible yard. Chairman Klaus stated that the utility of the space thus opened seemed very limited. Mr. Elmes stated the area will have plantings in future, making it more usable and private, and that though the property has many doors, not all are usable, and one is sealed shut and will remain so.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Martha Broughton stated that she is glad the house is being restored, but that it would be a mistake to convert the window to a door.

David Holman, resident of 2613 East Grace Street, stated his support for the project, and that the window alteration will make the house more livable, while not being exceptional or noticeable within the district.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for Commission discussion and a motion.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report. The Commission denied increasing the size of the opening on the first floor inset front elevation for the reasons cited in the staff report. The Commission approved the second story rear addition and the first story rear elevation opening provided that the following conditions are met: the color of the siding be in keeping with the Commission paint palette and be submitted to staff for review and approval and any future changes imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources or the National Park Service be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 4 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr. and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**No --** 3 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and Commissioner Sean Wheeler

**Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

- 15 [COA-048379-2019](#) 12-14 West Leigh Street - Rehabilitate two single-family attached residences.

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

Commissioner Morgan recused herself from consideration of this application.

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Staff recommended approval of the application, with the following conditions: that the bricked-in window openings be re-opened to their original size with the condition that the applicant provide dimensioned existing and proposed elevations to staff for review and approval; that any additional conditions imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and/or the National Park Service be submitted to staff for review and approval; and that the applicant submit a site plan with the location of the proposed HVAC system.

Chairman Klaus asked the applicant representative, Bruce Shirley, about earlier plans to remove a first floor projection from the front of the structure.

Mr. Shirley stated that DHR had insisted the original façade be retained.

Ms. Jones stated that this was not in the application, so staff did not address it.

Ms. Lizzie Drucker-Basch, the owner, stated that research indicated the building had been owned by Judge Sheffield, the first African-American judge in Richmond Circuit Court. Because the first floor projection may have been added by Judge Sheffield, DHR determined that it should be preserved.

Mr. Shirley stated that the HVAC is being reconfigured and will be on the roof, out of sight.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the applicant would be amenable to changing a rear sliding window to an awning window.

Mr. Shirley stated that they would have no objection.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor to a Commission motion.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved the application as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the bricked-in window openings be re-opened to their original size and the applicant provide dimensioned existing and proposed elevations to staff for review and approval, any additional conditions imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and/or the National Park Service be submitted to staff for review and approval, the applicant submit a site plan with the location of the proposed HVAC system, and the applicant install an awning window instead of a sliding window on the first story of the rear elevation. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

- 16** [COA-048381-2019](#) 14 1/2 West Leigh Street - Rehabilitate an existing, single-family residence; demolish rear section and reconstruct front porch.

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

Commissioner Morgan recused herself from consideration of this application.

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Ms. Jones stated that staff had reviewed this application with the applicant and had shared recently discovered historic photographs.

Staff recommended partial approval of the application. Staff recommended that the windows on the front facade be arched, not squared, and submitted to staff for review and approval.

Staff recommended denial of the proposed round columns and standing seam metal roof. Staff recommended that the applicant submit a revised column design for administrative review and approval. Staff recommended the applicant use a flat lock or a dark TPO roof for the porch.

Staff recommended denial of the proposed demolition of the rear section and revised elevations that account for the second story door. Staff recommended that the applicant submit a site plan with the location of the proposed HVAC system and any proposed site improvements for review and approval. Staff recommended that any additional conditions imposed by the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and/or the National Park Service be submitted for administrative review and approval.

Chairman Klaus asked about the balustrade visible in photos of the property. Ms. Jones stated that this was not specified in the application, but that hopefully it would be rebuilt and if so it would have to meet code and Commission Guidelines, and could be administratively approved. Chairman Klaus asked if Commission could require that the balustrade be included in the current proposal; Ms. Jones confirmed that they could.

Mr. Shirley, applicant representative, for this project as well as 12-14 West Leigh, stated that the concrete block addition which staff does not wish to be torn down is not original. Mr. Shirley stated that the rear two-story porch was at one time enclosed with CMU. Mr. Shirley would like to get rid of the CMU, which is deteriorated, and keep the porch enclosed.

Chairman Klaus stated that the property owner has not yet received the DHR report on this property. Depending on what that report says, various items reviewed by CAR may be revisited.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission discussion and a motion.

Commissioner Hendricks recommended deferral of the application until the DHR report is

complete.

Chairman Klaus stated that for the applicant's timing, an approval now even without the DHR report would be preferable; and also that, if DHR approves the CMU demolition which CAR is not approving, the applicant would then have to return to CAR for another review.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be partially approved for the reasons cited in the staff report. The Commission denied the porch column design and porch roof material and the demolition of the rear section for the reasons cited in the staff report. The Commission approved the rehabilitation of the building for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the windows on the façade be arched, not square, and specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the applicant submit a site plan with the location of the proposed HVAC system and any proposed site improvements for review and approval; and the applicant submit Part II application and approval letters from DHR and the NPS for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**17** [COA-048383-2019](#) 3420 East Marshall Street - Construct a rear addition.

**Attachments:** [Site Map](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application.

A previous owner received approval for exterior improvements to address work that was performed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Approval was not granted for the enclosure of two side porches and the installation of 1/1 windows. The work to abate the violation was not completed before the property was sold.

Staff recommended additional fenestration on the North 35th Street elevation that is horizontally aligned with the existing windows; that the shutters be removed from the design plans; that the addition be differentiated from the existing building with the use of decorative details such as a vertical trim board, fascia board below the roof gable, and a different foundation material, the revised design to be administratively approved.

Staff requested that the applicant submit the following for administrative review and approval: dimensioned elevations for all sides of the addition; and window specifications that meet the Guidelines.

Bill Voorhees, designer of the proposed addition, introduced himself.

Chairman Klaus asked if he had any issues with the staff recommendations. Mr.

Voorhees stated that he did not. Mr. Voorhees stated that he met with and received the approval of the Church Hill Association.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission discussion and a motion.

Commissioner Morgan requested clarification about the roof. Mr. Voorhees explained that it is a cross gable design.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the applicant add additional fenestration on the North 35th Street elevation that is horizontally aligned with the existing windows, the shutters be removed from the design plans, the addition be differentiated from the existing building with the use of decorative details such as a vertical trim board, fascia board below the roof gable, and a different foundation material, the revised design to be administratively approved, the applicant submit dimensioned elevations for all sides of the addition, and the window specifications that meet the Guidelines be submitted for staff review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 18 [COA-049230-2019](#) 1137 West Grace Street - Revise previously approved plans to modify window design.

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

Ms. Chelsea Jeffries presented this application.

The design of the new construction was previously approved on February 27, 2018. The approved design included single and paired 2/2 double hung sash aluminum clad wood windows with simulated divided lites.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed application, with the following conditions: that the windows be aluminum clad wood, and a dimensioned window detail and window specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval. Ms. Jeffries stated that the applicant has already responded by providing those further details to staff.

Walter Parks, the architect for the project, stated that the original 2/2 window design had been replaced with a 1/1 design as this seemed a better match with the rather spare building design. Chairman Klaus pointed out that the 1/1 design is also less expensive. Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission discussion and a motion.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, that this Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness be approved as submitted for the reasons cited in the staff report provided that the following conditions are met: the windows be aluminum clad wood and a dimensioned window detail and window specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

**No --** 1 - Commissioner James W. Klaus

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler

## **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

- 19 [COA-048390-2019](#) 101 South 15th Street - Add two stories to an existing, two-story building.

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

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Staff recommended that the building either be reduced in height or the second story be staggered to break up the massing; the applicant consider a horizontal decorative feature to reference the horizontal elements of the warehouse building such as a cornice element; the exterior panels be smooth; the applicant include any plans for upgrades to the existing parking lot in the final application or in a subsequent application; and that the applicant consider using fewer colors and/or a solid color for the metal panels.

Staff requested that the applicant submit the following for final review: Dimensioned elevations; context elevations with dimensions; floor plans detailed with the windows, doors, and balconies; a lighting plan for the building and site; window specifications that meet the Guidelines; additional details about how the railing and wall join; and any plans for new signage on the building.

Commissioner Pearson asked for clarification about staff's suggestion that the design be staggered. Ms. Jones stated that the current design appears somewhat like two blocks on top of another block, and that it could be further staggered to reduce this effect and break up the massing. Commissioner Wheeler suggested an inclined plane from the street as a way to approach this.

Nea Poole of Poole and Poole Architects introduced herself. Ms. Poole stated that there was some confusion about the Guidelines as they pertain to the massing on the top – whether it should be more set back, or less. There were also concerns about maintaining the urban wall effect with other tall buildings. The architects did attempt to break up the massing via undulating elevations.

Ms. Poole stated that it is difficult to fit the HVAC equipment given the space dedicated to a courtyard. Ms. Poole stated that of all the staff recommendations, pulling the apartment spaces back is most problematic, as it would require making the courtyard smaller, which in turn makes it more difficult to keep the HVAC equipment unobtrusive.

Ms. Poole stated agreement with most other staff recommendations, though she expressed concern about making the exterior colors too drab or monochromatic. She also stated that the proposed window design had been focused more on distinctiveness and less on the vinyl material used, the reasoning being that the material would not be discernible from a distance.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the owner had received tax credits for building rehabilitation. Ms. Poole affirmed that this was the case.

Chairman Klaus asked about the height of the courtyard and fitness center. Ms. Poole

stated that it is located 1 and ½ stories up, the additional half story being taken up by HVAC equipment in an out-of-sight location.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Patrick Zampetti stated that the architects had done a masterful job breaking up the scale and provided the horizontal massing that staff requested.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for Commission comments.

Chairman Klaus stated that the design is a great start and that setbacks and massing are fine. He stated concern that the color scheme refers to other buildings on the block but not to the gray building.

Commissioner Hendricks agreed with Chairman Klaus, adding that the proposed design looks totally incongruous and needs to be better integrated with the building it is set upon. He stated that he would like a deeper setback also.

Commissioner Pearson stated agreement with previous comments, and that he would be curious to see different iterations of the color scheme.

Commissioner Brewer stated agreement with Commissioner Hendricks' comments regarding the lack of relation between current building and addition, and that she would be more partial to a gray color scheme than to the red scheme.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he likes the design but agreed that there needs to be more reference to the current building, while maintaining distinctiveness.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that a bigger setback is required, and that a horizontal banding is appropriate.

Commissioner Bond stated agreement with other Commissioner comments, adding that the design looks like a townhouse from Midlothian, not appropriate to a downtown, industrial setting. He stated that the design appears heavy on the present building and that the color scheme is incoherent.

Commissioner Morgan stated agreement that the new design does need to refer more to the existing building, and suggested that materials such as corrugated stainless steel could be helpful in achieving this. She stated concern with the setback of balconies, which appear to be right on the face of the building. She stated that the stair tower needs to be better distinguished from older construction, while not becoming top-heavy in appearance. Ms. Morgan also stated that vinyl windows should not be used, as they are against the Guidelines.

Chairman Klaus asked if the applicant required any clarification, and commented that, though Commissioners do not always completely agree with one another, it falls to the applicant to discern tendencies of opinion.

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed.**

- 20 [COA-048387-2019](#) 2901 M Street - Potential demolition and construction of attached residences.

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



Ms. Jones presented this application.

Staff found that the ca. 1945 brick Cape Cod-style house contributes to the historic significance of the Church Hill North Historic District, and recommends against its demolition. Staff recommended that the applicant move the buildings closer to M Street to maintain the prevailing street set back; utilize a one-story, full-width porch in keeping with other attached dwellings in the district; consider a more angled pitch to the mansard and recess the dormer windows from the second story wall plane; and align the window and door openings; carry the wrapped porch deeper, possibly to the projecting bay as is a common form found in the district; consider adding openings into the front face of the projecting bay; increase the size of the openings on all visible elevations to be more rectangular in form and to increase the size of the window panes. Staff also recommended the applicant utilize a larger window on the first story in keeping with the general fenestration patterns found in the surrounding area; consider an entry door for the rear elevation; consider a bank of freestanding garages at the rear of the property to be more in keeping with the historic patterns found in the district.

Staff requested that the applicant provide the following for final review: specifications for the proposed composite materials and windows; a context elevation that compares the height of the proposed buildings with the other buildings in the historic district; additional porch details; dimensioned elevations without trees or other elements that obscure the building details; detailed elevations and information about the height of the proposed buildings; and, if the applicant intends to locate the mechanical equipment outside the building, the location of the HVAC equipment.

Patrick Zampetti of Studio Z Architecture introduced himself. Mr. Zampetti stated that a reason for demolishing the house as proposed is that it is an outlier in the district. Mr. Zampetti stated that the owner prefers the demolition-and-new-construction scheme as it would result in more rental units; and that he and the owner would be amenable to moving the proposed new building site closer to M Street. The current proposed site and setback is to allow for landscaping. Mr. Zampetti expressed concern that making the individual porches into one large porch would disrupt the human scale of the structure. Mr. Zampetti requested clarification about the mansard, whether it would be desirable to increase the slope so as to make it a more typical mansard configuration. Commissioner Morgan asked if this question pertained to the dormers also; Mr. Zampetti stated that it did, in that the dormers could be in line with the wall, as in the current design, or potentially pulled back in more traditional dormer configuration.

Commissioner Morgan clarified that a lower slope was recommended, so that the dormers could be recessed from the front. Mr. Zampetti stated that he would be inclined to bring back a revised design with a steeper slope and a taller window, if Commission is amenable. Commissioner Morgan stated that dormer windows should be secondary to other windows on the front elevation. Mr. Zampetti stated that bringing the roof angle down will help with the issue of a 3-story building attempting to pass as a 2 and ½ story building.

Mr. Zampetti stated that the window and door misalignment was an oversight and will be corrected. He stated that the landscaping will be removed from the drawings for clarity, as long as landscaping is not required as part of the submitted design.

Mr. Zampetti asked about allowed types of windows. Chairman Klaus stated that a specific brand and model of window should be submitted for final approval, and that generally they would be aluminum clad.

Mr. Zampetti stated that the main issue with staff recommendations is the suggestion of detached garages, which he stated would push the project beyond allowed lot coverage,

also increasing impervious lot coverage which is environmentally not ideal. Mr. Zampetti stated that on-street parking is more typical in the area. The rear-loaded garages were proposed for security reasons.

Mr. Zampetti stated that the softer-edged “suburban” appearance of the proposed structure is not incongruous, given the open park area across the street.

Commissioner Pearson asked if Mr. Zampetti’s client’s family had built the house. Mr. Zampetti stated that he didn’t know, but that it had been in the family for many years. Commissioner Pearson asked if it was the owner’s preference that the building be torn down and a new one built in its place; Mr. Zampetti confirmed that this was the owner’s preferred outcome. Commissioner Pearson asked if the rear driveway would be a private driveway. Mr. Zampetti confirmed that it would be, for the shared use of residents of the rental units.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Kim Chen, a resident of Church Hill and the author of the Church Hill North National Register nomination, stated that she has concerns about the application, and feels that the preservation of a house with strong connections to African-American history in the area is extremely important. She stated that such buildings are being rapidly lost and that, even as aesthetic outliers, they contribute significantly to an understanding of the evolution of that community.

Commissioner Bond stated that scale is important but, without context elevation drawings, it was difficult to determine the scale of the proposed new building. In the event that the small historic house is not demolished, Commissioner Bond stated that new construction around it should refer to that structure and not simply overshadow it.

Commissioner Wheeler agreed with Commissioner Bond’s comments, and stated that the historic house should not be torn down, though perhaps an addition could be built onto it. Commissioner Wheeler stated that he did not care for the dormers, and cited new construction around the corner as having more successful examples of dormer-like structures.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the historic house needs to be retained, and that some creative new construction should be done behind it to create a transition from old to new.

Commissioner Brewer agreed that the house should be retained, because it is unique and special, as well as because it speaks to the history of the neighborhood. Commissioner Brewer stated that the dormers could be fewer or smaller, and pointed out that, if a less prominent porch is desired, an inset one could be considered and would not be incongruous. Commissioner Brewer stated that she was not in support of the rear garages.

Commissioner Pearson expressed support for most of the staff recommendations. He stated that he was on the fence regarding the demolition of the historic house, given that the owner, whose family has had the house for some time, desires the demolition in order to generate more revenue from the property; and that he intended to consult further with Kim Chen to better understand the historical significance.

Commissioner Pearson stated that, given the seven-foot setback recently allowed for a nearby school, the Commission should not be strict with the applicant regarding proposed setback.

Commissioner Hendricks stated his agreement with other Commissioners, and added that the applicant could consider building four units instead of three.

Chairman Klaus stated his opposition to the proposed garages, and also expressed disagreement with Commissioner Pearson regarding the setback, stating that it should be consistent with other houses on the block. Chairman Klaus expressed agreement with Commissioner Brewer regarding preserving the historic house, adding that the passage of time will increase its distinctiveness. Regarding the style of the proposed new construction, Chairman Klaus stated that it is too indistinct, neither one thing nor another, and recommended the townhouses built behind the restaurant Alewife as an example of new construction integrating well with old.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the demolition of the historic house cannot be justified, and also that any adjustment in setback would have to be justified. Commissioner Morgan stated that the proposed driveway seemed anomalous in the area, and thus problematic, and that there should be a differentiating break in the massing between units. Commissioner Morgan agreed with Commissioners Wheeler and Bond that the new construction needed to be in proportion to neighboring buildings.

Mr. Zampetti stated that he has to provide off-street parking, thus the driveway is unavoidable, adding that the driveway is a useful safety feature for emergency vehicles.

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed**

- 21 [COA-048373-2019](#) 1006 West Franklin Street - Construct a new third floor addition.

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

Commissioner Brewer recused herself from review of this application, and of the application for 1002-1004 West Franklin Street.

At Chairman Klaus' request, this application and the one following (COA-048374-2019) were presented and reviewed together.

Ms. Jeffries presented this application.

Staff recommended that the rear windows should be aligned with the windows below, if they are visible from the alley.

Staff requested that the following information be submitted for final review: A list of final materials, including colors; and a fully dimensioned elevations and site plan.

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed**

- 22 [COA-048374-2019](#) 1002-1004 West Franklin Street - Construct a new multi-family residence.

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

Ms. Jeffries presented this application.

Staff recommended that the projecting bay continue to the third story and feature a prominent roof element to be more consistent with patterns found on the block; that the proposed dormer window could also be enlarged to achieve architectural continuity; that transoms on the third story be removed to be more consistent with patterns in the district; and that the split face masonry also clad the first story of the projecting bays, to be consistent with patterns found on the block.

Staff requested that the following information be submitted for final review: a list of final materials, including colors; a fully dimensioned elevations and site plan; accurate floor plans; and information regarding the demolition of the addition on 1000 West Franklin Street.

The architect, David Johannas, introduced himself. Regarding 1006 West Franklin, Mr. Johannas stated that he would be amenable to working with window alignment and checking sight-lines. Mr. Johannas mentioned that the building at 1006 is in extremely poor condition and was uninhabited for 20 years, and that applying for historic tax credits for the work is being considered.

Regarding the new in-fill construction proposed for 1002-1004 West Franklin, Mr. Johannas, Mr. Johannas stated that the historic tax credit process is underway with DHR, and a Part 2 approval has been received, with comments from DHR. Regarding demolition at the site, Mr. Johannas stated that the concrete abutment was built after 1927, after the period of historic interest as defined by DHR. Also after 1927, a concrete radiation-resistant addition was built onto the basement and first floor.

Mr. Johannas stated that the two-story projecting bays are an integral part of the proposed design, which he believes complement the building and respond to other bays in the district. Mr. Johannas stated that houses in the district are also rather eclectic. Mr. Johannas stated that he believes the Guidelines as regards rustication are more lenient than staff's interpretation, and that the rusticated block looks nice with the brick. Mr. Johannas stated that bisecting the line of the projecting bays would diminish a pleasing sense of height the design now conveys, and stated that a three-bay house across the street uses rusticated material below the sill.

Mr. Johannas stated that he would be amenable to changing the casement windows in the transoms as per staff suggestions.

Mr. Johannas read aloud from DHR's approval letter, which asked that the top level design be simplified, the dormers of a simple, flat or gabled design instead of arched, and the windows at the third floor balconies should not have arched transoms projecting over the top of the gutter line.

Chairman Klaus asked which parts of the property received DHR tax credits. Mr. Johannas stated that this only applied to the renovation, but since new construction is in the same lot, it also comes under DHR's purview.

Commissioner Pearson expressed interest in the radiation-proof structure and its possible historic significance. Mr. Johannas stated that this was built for a routine, for its time, medical use of x-rays.

Commissioner Hendricks asked if the fire escape of 1000 West Franklin would be removed; Mr. Johannas confirmed that it would.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the bays are appropriately subservient to those of neighboring houses; that the curved dormers might be acceptable to him if the curve on

one side of the building were repeated on the other side.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the existing structures have a continuous horizontal line running through them which he'd like to see on the in-fill construction, whether it be a sill or header. Some of the brick massing in back needs aesthetically to be anchored, e.g., by piers, or the transom windows.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the project would have to undergo zoning review. Mr. Johannas stated that a special use permit had been applied for and received.

Commissioner Johnson stated his support for the project.

Commissioner Pearson stated that he likes the proposed design, and also agrees with staff recommendations. Commissioner Pearson asked if staff could do more research on the building which had been used as a doctor's office and is planned to be demolished, to assess its possible historical significance.

Commissioner Hendricks stated his support for the construction at 1006 West Franklin, and for the style of the design at 1002 West Franklin, adding that the rusticated block, though not his favorite, does not present a problem to him.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he had nothing to add, other than to echo DHR's comments about the detailing.

Commissioner Morgan expressed support for the design, and asked that sample materials be brought for the next review.

Mr. Johannas stated that the Guidelines used to have language to the effect that demolition, if beneficial to a neighborhood, can be permitted. Ms. Jones confirmed this, stating that this is cited in the staff report.

**This Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conceptually reviewed**

## **Adjournment**

Chairman Klaus adjourned the meeting at 8:13 PM.