



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, May 28, 2019

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### Call to Order

James Klaus, the Chairman, called the business portion of the May 28 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:32 pm.

### Roll Call

**Present --** 6 - \* Commissioner Sanford Bond, \* Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, \* Commissioner James W. Klaus, \* Commissioner Sean Wheeler, \* Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and \* Mitch Danese

**Absent --** 3 - \* Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., \* Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer and \* Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

### Approval of Minutes

April 9, 2019, Quarterly Meeting

April 23, 2019

### Other Business

#### Secretary's Report

Carey Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review, stated that the Planning and Preservation office has been fielding requests for some information which go above and beyond typical staff requests for information. These have been forwarded to the division's Freedom of Information Act Liaison, Isaac Marks. Staff will also be attending a training soon on Freedom of Information Act requests. The training will be during the day and available to Commissioners as well. Chairman Klaus stated that he attended this training once and found it worthwhile.

#### Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones stated that the administrative approvals and building permits report was distributed electronically to the Commission members. Ms. Jones noted that there was a large increase in the number of administrative approvals for this month. The Commissioners did not have any questions about the administrative approvals and building permits report.

#### Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that there has been an uptick in violations of a spring-maintenance nature, such as replacing siding and fences, and repainting, without approval. A

postcard-sized mailing is in the works, to send to all property owners in City Old and Historic Districts to inform them that they should contact CAR before starting projects.

Commissioner Pearson asked if there was any update on an enforcement action from a few months ago involving a fence around a parking lot in Jackson Ward. Ms. Jones stated that staff has been in contact with the owner to follow up, letting them know that to remedy the situation they need only remove the fence.

#### Other Committee Reports

Chairman Klaus stated that the upcoming Urban Design Committee meeting on June 6 will review one project that is within a City Old & Historic District: the Beth Ahabah Synagogue at 1121 West Franklin Street is proposing to install bollards, for security purposes. This project would be funded by a grant from the federal government. Because it is in the public right of way, it falls under UDC's rather than CAR's purview. Ms. Jones confirmed this, stating that she had met with representatives of Beth Ahabah and the Department of Public Works, and it had been determined that the project is an encroachment. Joshua Son, Secretary to the UDC, will share CAR staff feedback on the project at the June 6 meeting.

Chairman Klaus stated that there will be a thank-you event for boards and commissions at 6pm on Thursday May 30th, on the City Hall observation deck. Commissioners should have received an invite to this.

Chairman Klaus raised the question of a property that is in violation, and whether there is a mechanism by which the continuing violation can be flagged when the property is put up for sale, thus giving the owner an incentive to remedy the violation before selling. Ms. Jones stated that her understanding is, any violation should be disclosed as part of the sale of a property. She stated, and Commissioner Pearson elaborated, that the owner and/or real estate agent are obligated to disclose such information, but it is not part of the public record or included in the title in some way. Commissioner Pearson stated that Virginia is a "buyer beware" state, so buyers must research thoroughly. However, most enhanced title policies offer coverage for zoning violations as long as the purchaser was not aware of them.

#### Review of National Register Nomination

##### [NHR 2019 3](#) Third Street Bethel AME Church 2019

**Attachments:** [Third Street Bethel AME Church Update and Boundary Expansion](#)

The nomination was presented by Chelsea Jeffries.

The Third Street Bethel AME Church was listed on the National Register in 1975. The church is also a contributing resource in the Jackson Ward Historic District which is also a National Historic Landmark Historic District.

The 2019 Update and Boundary Increase generally updates and clarifies the nomination and extends the boundaries to include the entire parcel and a 2002 addition to the church.

The updates in this nomination include adding a justification for the building's local significance in the area of Religion, which was not included in the original nomination; the addition of 1867 and 1914 as significant dates; the period of significance was more

explicitly defined and extended to 1970 to include significant events of the 20th century; Architecture under Criterion C and Ethnic Heritage: African American under Criterion A were also added as areas of significance.

As the 2019 Update and Boundary Increase is a general update of an individually listed and significant building, staff recommends the Commission support the nomination.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that the property in question is right next to the Maggie Walker House, and that it is already part of a Historic District.

Chairman Klaus asked for clarification about the part of the parcel that would be added with the Expansion. Ms. Jeffries stated that when the property was first nominated, the whole parcel was not included in the nomination. This Expansion would include the whole parcel, which includes a fellowship hall addition which was built in 2002.

Commissioner Pearson asked if the 2002 structure would be included as a contributing structure. Ms. Jeffries stated that, as an addition to the church, the 2002 component is not a separate structure. The boundary expansion does however include all the buildings and structures on the property.

Ms. Jones stated that nominations used to be written for only the original part of a building or property, whereas nowadays they take in the entirety of the parcel. Thus the current expansion is bringing the property in line with current practice. Ms. Jeffries pointed out that the original nomination was a very early one.

Chairman Klaus asked why the expansion is deemed necessary, in light of the entire property already being situated within the Jackson Ward Historic District, and thus eligible for the same advantages such as tax credits. Ms. Jeffries and Ms. Jones stated that the expansion is essentially a cleaning up, to make this National Register's boundaries in line with current practice, while also adding areas of significance in light of current values and practice.

Chairman Klaus asked if the Third Street Bethel AME Church is in a City Old and Historic District as well as a National Register Historic District. Ms. Jeffries stated that it is not.

Chairman Klaus reminded the Commission that they were merely being asked to give their recommendation to the Department of Historic Resources, and state whether they agree with their revision.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, to recommend support for the Third Street Bethel AME Church Update and Boundary Expansion. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

**\*\*\*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 an application is placed on the consent agenda and they do not think it belongs there, they would have an opportunity to have it moved back to the regular agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, with Commissioner Wheeler seconding, to move the 2nd item, COA-053437-2019, 2516 Monument Avenue to the consent agenda. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Bond, with Commissioner Wheeler seconding, to move the 3rd item, COA-053432-2019, 1853 West Grace 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 8th item, COA-053434-2019, 3209 Monument Avenue to the consent agenda. Chairman Klaus stated that he had spoken to the applicants, and that they had found a tile to match the existing which they would use instead of bluestone, and that they were willing to retain the cement front steps. The top step is non-original brick; the applicants expressed willingness to comply with staff recommendations, and to submit a plan for fixing the steps to be administratively approved. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 10th item, COA-053438-2019, 2010 West Grace Street to the consent agenda. Chairman Klaus clarified that round posts are proposed, not the square posts as in the plans, and that the proposal is consistent with the historic appearance of the property. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 7th item, COA-054511-2019, 604 St. James Street to the consent agenda. Commissioner Wheeler pointed out that the Commission previously approved this, and the subsequent changes seem minor. Chairman Klaus concurred, stating that the change is that the applicants have switched which of the existing openings will remain open and which will be closed. Ms. Jones stated that the applicants also have confirmed that they will be installing arched windows to match the arched windows of the façade. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Bond seconding, to move the 14th item, COA-053439-2019, 2320-2326 Burton Street to the consent agenda. Chairman Klaus stated that the staff condition of excluding the faux shutters should be preserved. The Commission unanimously approved moving the item.

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

There was no public comment.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, that the Consent Agenda be approved with staff conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 1 [COA-054468-2019](#) 2308 East Marshall Street - Replace front door with a new design, remove a rear stair, and convert rear, second-story door into a window.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: details regarding the treatment of the existing side lights be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; and the new window fit between the existing jambs without the need to modify the width of the existing opening and be wood or aluminum clad wood with true or simulated divided lights, window specifications to be submitted to staff for administrative review. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 2 [COA-053437-2019](#) 2516 Monument Avenue - Construct a new rear deck with a partial covering; repair existing front porch floor and walkway; install a new fence.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 3 [COA-053432-2019](#) 1853 West Grace Street - Renovate an existing first-story, previously enclosed side porch, and enclose a portion of a second-story side porch.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

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

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 8 [COA-053434-2019](#) 3209 Monument Avenue - Renovate an existing front porch.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the front patio be repaired and the materials be replaced in-kind with concrete, brick and tile as required and intact materials be retained where possible; the applicant maintain the steps; and work with staff to replace the top stair. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 10 [COA-053438-2019](#) 2010 West Grace Street - Remove an existing concrete front porch and construct a new covered front porch.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant utilize a simple railing profile and the railing design be submitted to staff for review and approval; the roof material specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the gutter profile and materials be submitted for staff review and approval; and the column be round, not square as shown on some of the plans. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 7 [COA-054511-2019](#) 604 St. James Street - Revise approved plans for the rehabilitation of an existing building.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the window specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the applicant submit a site plan with the location of the proposed HVAC system on the ground; and screening for the trash receptacles be utilized with details to be submitted to staff for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 14 [COA-053439-2019](#) 2320-2326 Burton Street - Renovate four existing single-family attached residences.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Hendricks, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant utilize simple, square posts for the porch supports with the specifications to be submitted for staff review and approval; the applicant install wood lattice between, not in front, of the new brick piers; the applicant submit a paint scheme for the body, trim, and replacement porch materials including the columns, railings, and deck, and the fence using colors from the wood frame Italianate palette for staff review and approval; and the vinyl shutters not be re-installed. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

- 4 [COA-053436-2019](#) 2304-2306 Venable Street - Rehabilitate two semi-attached, single-family residences.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jeffries presented this application.

Staff recommended that the application be approved with the following conditions: The work be performed in conformance with a Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions; and any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service be submitted to CAR staff for administrative review and approval; revised drawings that match the historic cornice be submitted for administrative review and approval; the cornice and front porch be constructed of wood, paint colors to be administratively approved by staff; the front porches have turned wooden posts which align with the porch cornice brackets and a Richmond rail; revised elevations to be submitted to staff for administrative review; the existing arches and jambs of the rear doors be maintained and the new windows fit between the jambs of the existing opening; a site plan with the location of the units be submitted for administrative review and approval; the design of the addition be modified in a manner to be administratively reviewed and approved by staff to limit the use of solid panels by including additional glazing and shutters if the addition of glazing does not accommodate the desired floor plans; the new rear stairs be painted or stained a neutral color to be administratively approved by staff, and utilize a Richmond Rail.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the applicant had provided plans for the brick in front, stating that they appeared patchwork and he could not discern if they were painted or unpainted. Ms. Jeffries said the application did not indicate that any brick would be

painted, but that the applicant could respond to this question.

Chairman Klaus asked for clarification regarding the disagreement between the existing cornices and what was represented in the drawings submitted. Ms. Jeffries stated that there was some disagreement between the drawings and photographs submitted: there was an extra bracket shown between the two buildings, so staff is recommending that that be removed.

The applicant, Sam Tuttle of Streetcar Properties, introduced himself and stated that the brick on the front façade was painted and the intent is to paint the façade only. Mr. Tuttle stated that the applicants are fine with all of staff's conditions, especially in light of a historic photo which shows the turned columns as recommended.

Mr. Tuttle stated that the proposal currently under review has been reviewed and approved already, for 2306 Venable Street, by the Department of Historic Resources for historic tax credits. Mr. Tuttle did not foresee the revised columns being a problem for DHR, given the historic photo evidence supporting them. Mr. Tuttle requested that, rather than the suggested Richmond rail between the columns, the applicants be allowed to have no railing at all at that location. Mr. Tuttle stated that he believes railings would not be required by code. Mr. Tuttle stated that given the absence of Richmond rail between the columns in the historic photo, he believes DHR would oppose its inclusion. The applicants propose a simple black metal handrail for the steps, which could be administratively approved.

Chairman Klaus stated that he was interested to see the railing shown in the photo from the 1930s. Mr. Tuttle stated that the railing shown in that photo is different on each side. Chairman Klaus explained that the two railings are actually from two different historic photos, one of which is from a later time period, the 1950s – 1970s. Mr. Tuttle stated that the DHR application for 2306 Venable Street places some constraints, and also that the applicants would prefer to keep the railing consistent across the two addresses of the property.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Commissioner Hendricks mentioned that one public comment letter had been received, and that it was in support of the proposal. Hearing no further comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for a Commission motion.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the work be performed in conformance with a Part II Tax Credit application approval and conditions and any additional conditions subsequently imposed by DHR or the National Park Service be submitted to CAR staff for administrative review and approval; revised drawings that match the historic cornice be submitted for administrative review and approval; the cornice and front porch be constructed of wood, paint colors to be administratively approved by staff; the front porches have turned wooden posts which align with the porch cornice brackets and a Richmond rail if required by code and revised elevations be submitted to staff for administrative review; the front steps have a simple metal handrail; the existing arches and jambs of the rear doors be maintained and the new windows fit between the jambs of the existing opening; a site plan with the location of the HVAC units be submitted for administrative review and approval; the design of the addition be modified in a manner to be administratively reviewed and approved by staff to limit the use of solid panels by including additional glazing and shutters if the addition of glazing does not accommodate the desired floor plans; the new rear stairs be painted or stained a neutral color to be administratively approved by staff, and**

utilize a Richmond rail. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye --** 5 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks,  
Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Mitch Danese

**Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

5 [COA-052322-2019](#) 411 North 22nd Street - Construct a new, single-family residence.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)  
[Application and Plans \(4/23/2019\)](#)  
[Site Map](#)  
[Staff Report \(4/23/2019\)](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Staff recommended approval of the application, with the following conditions: the HVAC equipment be located in the rear or side yard in keeping with the Guidelines; that the brick foundation and exterior siding be utilized in a manner that the foundation appears to be level; and that the applicant provide information about how the grade will be addressed from the area indicated from the steps to the rear of the property for staff review and approval.

Commissioner Hendricks requested clarification regarding the HVAC location. Ms. Jones referred to the guidelines which state that in general HVAC equipment should be located in rear yards, in locations out of sight to passersby, though in this case the applicant has been given leeway to propose a rooftop HVAC location. Ms. Jones pointed out that the screening proposed for the HVAC is of a design and grey color typical of the types of HVAC screening which CAR has approved in the past.

Chairman Klaus stated that the HVAC placement guidelines are somewhat confusing, as rear yard placement is strongly recommended, yet a rooftop option is also included.

Commissioner Bond stated that rooftops would seem to be a better location for HVAC noise mitigation.

Commissioner Wheeler asked for clarification regarding the staff recommendation for the foundation line.

The applicant representative Mr. Enoch Pou, stated that the applicants had applied to the Board of Zoning Appeals to lift the on-site parking requirement, thus enabling the design to be modified to omit the garage of previous versions. Mr. Pou stated that the applicants have included in their latest submission details about the privacy fence, and the retaining wall with the cut-in grade. The application also states that if it is necessary to combine the fence and wall, their combined height will be within accepted limits. The revised application also includes line-of-sight drawings as requested at the previous review, based on views from the opposite side of 22nd Street and from the opposite side of the 12-foot alley. Mr. Pou stated that the designs show the equipment would not be visible.

Mr. Pou stated that the HVAC equipment has been placed on the rooftop for the reason of ambiguity in the guidelines, as discussed by Commissioners, and because if placed in the side yard there would be insufficient room to service it, and because of the wish to

maximize green space in the yard.

Mr. Pou stated that the applicants had done their best in providing the topographical survey as requested at a previous review.

Chairman Klaus requested clarification if the applicants would also be requesting from BZA that they be allowed to eliminate the 3-foot setback on one side of the property. Mr. Pou confirmed this.

Commissioner Hendricks expressed mild concern about sight lines and areas of intermittent visibility of the HVAC equipment on the roof, to a person working their way east down the alley. Mr. Hendricks suggested, partly for this reason but mostly in the interest of noise containment, that the equipment be located above the staircase and closet on the second floor, where washer and dryer units are located.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Neighbor Bill Hartstock asked, as a matter of procedure, how the application could be approved by the Commission if the setback had not yet been approved by Zoning, since a difference in setback would affect the design. Chairman Klaus stated that there had been considerable discussion about this, his understanding of the Zoning Board's requirement is that the applicant apply for the zoning variance with an approved building design, so the Zoning Board can see what would be there. Chairman Klaus stated that Commission approval in no way means that Commission has any recommendation on the zoning question, either in favor or opposed to the variance.

Mr. Hartsock expressed concern about the HVAC sightlines for neighbors, stating that the roof is visible to some neighbors and that he would much prefer the HVAC equipment be off the roof entirely, and placed on the back of the lot. Mr. Hartsock stated that from looking at the plans and pictures he could not discern where the retaining wall would be located, how it would be designed, or what materials it would be made of. He also stated that he could not discern the projected fence location.

Mr. Hartsock stated that his house, next door at 2202 East Marshall Street, is on a similar incline to the alley, and that as a result the back of the house has a crawlspace of more than 4 feet, while the front has a crawlspace of a foot. Mr. Hartsock stated that he is not sure why something similar could not have been done with this new construction in relation to the alley.

Neighbor Michael Beller, resident of 2200 East Marshall, expressed agreement with Mr. Hartsock's lack of clarity about the retaining wall's appearance. Mr. Beller expressed concern about safety, given the steep grade of the site.

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

Commissioner Hendricks made a motion to approve with conditions as stated in the staff report, except for the staff recommendation to place the HVAC equipment in the rear or side yard. Commissioner Hendricks moved that Commission allow the HVAC equipment be kept on the roof, but that it be located closer to the center of the building mass to avoid views from the public way east of the alley.

Commissioner Klaus, in further defining the motion, stated that the issues with the brick foundation design transition should be resolved by way of the applicants working with staff

to arrive at a design to be administratively approved, and that this should also be the case for the fence and the retaining wall. Commissioner Pearson seconded the motion.

Commissioner Hendricks summarized his understanding of the retaining wall situation: that the top of the wall would slope with the grade.

Commissioner Wheeler suggested treating the siding on the back half of the building as similar to step flashing. Commissioner Klaus stated that this was a good suggestion, and that the staff had not been very specific about how this should be done. Mr. Klaus affirmed that the siding on the back half would still need to be administratively approved.

Commissioner Hendricks and Commissioner Wheeler briefly discussed what would be a good step pattern for the foundation transition. This discussion concluded with Commissioner Hendricks stating "it can be administratively approved."

Chairman Klaus reiterated that he understood the proposed plan still had to go before the Zoning Board, and affirmed that the Commission's decision should not be interpreted as either for or against the requested zoning variance.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the HVAC equipment be moved to the center of the building mass; the applicant work with staff to design a stepped foundation design; the applicant provide information about the how the grade will be addressed from the area indicated from the steps to the rear of the property for staff review and approval; and the details of the fence and retaining wall be submitted to staff for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

**6** [COA-054512-2019](#) 401 North 27th Street - Repair exterior stucco and structural masonry.

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

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Staff recommended that due to the age and significance of the building, the applicant take a holistic approach to the rehabilitation of this building. Staff recommended a structural engineer perform additional investigations to determine the cause of cracking and deterioration, and develop a plan to address the causes and fix any structural deficiencies. The plan should provide information about appropriate repairs to the mortar, bricks, and stucco, including how the damaged materials will be removed, the type of replacement materials, and how they will be applied. Staff requested that all stabilization and repairs be completed in a timely manner with approved building permits.

Staff recommended approval of the proposal, with the following conditions: the applicant submit a comprehensive report on the condition of the building prepared by a qualified structural engineer and an application to address all of the structural issues with the building; the applicant work with a preservation mason to identify appropriate methods for

the removal of the stucco and mortar that will not damage the historic masonry in order to prevent further damage to the brick; the applicant work with a preservation mason to determine the appropriate replacement mortar and stucco with the details submitted to staff for review and approval; the damaged or missing bricks be replaced with a suitable replacement found in consultation with a preservation mason.

Walter York, the property owner, introduced himself, and stated that since purchasing the building he has not been able to do anything with it. He had wanted to open a restaurant in the building but was not allowed to do so.

Chairman Klaus stated that this property is especially challenging due to the building being among the oldest in the region. Mr. York agreed, stating that he had not known what he was getting into. Mr. York stated that the building had fallen down and that he had put it back up, and now wants to fix it up.

Chairman Klaus asked if Mr. York has any problem with the staff recommendation of bringing in a structural engineer to examine the building. Mr. York stated that he would follow an engineer's recommendations, adding that Ms. Jones had already spoken with him about the appropriate kind of mortar to use.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

Cyane Crump, Executive Director of Historic Richmond, introduced herself. She stated that the Wills Store, the property in question, is one of the oldest and most significant buildings in Church Hill, built between 1813 and 1815 by Captain Charles Wills. It is believed to be the oldest commercial building still extant in Richmond, and was in use as a grocery store until the 1940s and was later used as a laundry until 2004. In 2008 the storefront was in danger of collapsing and Historic Richmond urged the City to make use of its Spot Blight Abatement to address the condition of the building. Ms. Crump stated that, to her understanding, repairs were made but in a limited and piecemeal fashion; now, ten years later, the same issues have resurfaced. Due to the building's age and significance, Ms. Crump emphasized that work on it should be addressed holistically. Ms. Crump expressed concern that the current application only addresses mortar and stucco repairs for one façade, stating that the root cause of deterioration, which could be water infiltration from a different source, could not be dealt with in this manner. Ms. Crump stated that the make-up of historic masonry requires using a mortar both softer and more vapor-permeable than the bricks. Ms. Crump stated that, similarly, minor stucco repairs will not solve the root cause of any deterioration. Ms. Crump stated that the condition of the building warrants a full rehabilitation guided by a preservation plan that addresses all issues and the order and method of repairs, and overseen by a conservator and a structural engineer.

Chairman Klaus asked if Ms. Crump knew of any resources she could recommend for the applicant, such as names of people, or of organizations specializing in historic preservation which could provide guidance. Ms. Crump stated that Historic Richmond's mission is historic preservation and neighborhood revitalization; that the Foundation has done a lot of work in the Church Hill area; and that they would be happy to discuss with the applicant their resources and the contractors and engineers they have worked with.

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

Commissioner Bond asked if this might be a good candidate for a historic tax credit, and that the expertise of the Department of Historic Resources, which administers the historic

tax credit program, would be very helpful. Chairman Klaus suggested that staff could provide the contact information to the applicant.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant submit a comprehensive report on the condition of the building prepared by a qualified structural engineer and an application to address all of the structural issues with the building; the applicant work with a preservation mason to identify appropriate methods for the removal of the stucco and mortar that will not damage the historic masonry in order to prevent further damage to the brick; the applicant work with a preservation mason to determine the appropriate replacement mortar and stucco with the details submitted to staff for review and approval; the damaged or missing bricks be replaced with a suitable replacement found in consultation with a preservation mason; and all work be performed in a timely manner and with approved building permits. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

11 [COA-052430-2019](#) 101 South 15th Street - Add two stories to an existing two-story building.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)  
[Application and Plans \(4/23/2019\)](#)  
[Site Map](#)  
[Staff Report \(4/23/2019\)](#)

This application was presented by Ms. Jones. Staff recommended approval of the application, with the following recommendations: the window and door final specifications, including design and materials, be submitted for review and approval, and be reflected on the building permit plans in a door and window schedule; lighting specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval; any additional items not included in the application, including upgrades to an existing parking lot and any proposed signage, be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval.

Architect for the project Nea Poole, introduced herself and structural engineer Danny Rudd.

Ms. Poole stated that in the current revised plan, in response to Commission feedback about the color scheme, the addition design has been made more monochromatic, perhaps making it more similar to the existing building below. For the corner of the addition a rust red, to match brick, was selected.

Chairman Klaus asked for clarification as to why the interstitial space which the Commission had asked to be moved back slightly, had not been moved back. Mr. Rudd stated that the addition will be posting up from the existing columns which extend to the outer edge of the building, and the section in question also would be built out to cover mechanical equipment.

Commissioner Hendricks asked for clarification about the mechanicals. Ms. Poole stated that the restaurant requires a lot of mechanical equipment. Commissioner Hendricks

asked why the upper portion of the addition, above the interstitial section, could not be pushed back more, in line with the Commission request. Ms. Poole stated that pulling back on one side sacrifices room for the inner courtyard, which diminishes the quality of the residences.

Commissioner Wheeler asked about the positioning of the guardrail and staircase, which the Commission had requested be moved. Ms. Poole stated that the extension of the staircase has to align with the existing staircase; if they are both moved this will impinge on existing space which is already leased out. Ms. Poole stated that she had not remembered the guardrails being an issue from previous reviews, but that they could be pulled back. Ms. Poole expressed concern that, with the interstitial space forward and other parts pulled back, the interstitial space might appear to be part of the original building.

Commissioner Bond asked about the location of the existing columns. Mr. Rudd stated that they are in the exterior wall, right below the parapet, and that a beam line will be added to support the new addition which is set back.

The applicant /owner of the property, Margaret Freund, stated that there are walkways, a courtyard, and HVAC equipment in the central courtyard of the addition, and this is why there is resistance to the idea of pulling in the setback too far, as it would reduce the courtyard space. The applicant had also had the idea of setting the top away from the atrium to preserve or refer to the relationship between the original buildings.

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

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application with staff recommendations.

Commissioner Bond stated that the proposed addition is better than previous versions, "quieter" in appearance, but still does not integrate with the existing building.

Commissioner Hendricks expressed agreement with Commissioner Bond, and stated that the setback could and should be deeper, that the mass of the building should generally be pushed toward the interior. Commissioner Hendricks also stated that the façade is too frenetic and incongruent with the existing building, and that he would like there to be a simple color palette.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the proposed design does not meet the Guidelines for new construction, which state that additions should be subordinate in size and as inconspicuous as possible.

Commissioner Hendricks suggested that the HVAC equipment all be put on the rooftop and that the courtyard be placed around the perimeter, instead of the interior.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that it is challenging to assess the new construction, as the Commission is only being shown the exterior details, not the interior.

Vice-Chair Hendricks that the applicants could just build a platform to put the addition on top of instead of the interstitial space.

Chairman Klaus stated that the current review is the third one for this project, that advice was given at the previous two, and that it may be inappropriate to give new advice at this

junction. Commissioner Hendricks stated that it has been the same advice given each time.

A vote was taken and the motion failed by the following vote:

Aye – 3 – Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Mitch Danese

No – 3 – Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Jason Hendricks, Commissioner Sean Wheeler

A motion was made by Commissioner Hendricks, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to defer the application in order to give the applicant an opportunity to submit a design with simpler form, massing, and color palette, specifically as regards the sloped roof and overstated corners, as well as to step in the addition further.

Chairman Klaus stated that at the last meeting two Commissioners had specific issues, which were dealt with following the meeting with the applicants, and now it seems as if new issues are being raised. Commissioner Bond stated that the sloped roof had been raised at the previous meeting. Commissioner Hendricks stated that the material palette is revised in the current design, but not enough.

Commissioner Wheeler proposed an amendment to the motion that the stair tower be stepped in, and also the guardrail on the primary floor near the second floor, adding that this might require a slight increase in the height of the addition. Commissioner Hendricks expressed agreement.

Ms. Freund stated that she would prefer a denial to a deferral.

Jennifer Mullen, representing the owner, stated that staff had found the stair tower consistent with the guidelines in that it is a continuation of the existing stair tower, and the new materials are differentiated from the existing. Ms. Mullen stated that the applicant had increased the setback back in accordance with Commission request, and that moving the courtyard to the periphery as currently suggested is not what the application is for. Ms. Mullen argued that the latest revised design is good as is, that the corners refer to the design of an original brick building nearby, and stated “we do not consent to another deferral.”

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he does not advocate for an exterior courtyard, but that the setback should be maximized, more than it is in the current proposed design, which would reduce the interior courtyard.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the new construction next door, with a glass atrium, is a good example of an setback which helps to differentiate the new construction from the existing. Commissioner Bond stated that the applicants have gone a considerable way to accommodating Commission requests, but that there is no reason to not make it even better, given the historic site.

Chairman Klaus suggested that there might be a way to approve the application while specifying design aspects as yet to be administratively approved. Commissioner Hendricks asked the engineer, Mr. Rudd, if there were structural issues with moving the wall further back. Mr. Rudd stated that the architect would have to comment. The applicant stated that increasing the setback would make the rental units, which are studios to begin with, too small. Commissioner Hendricks stated that the room size reduction could be made up by reducing the interior courtyard size.

Commissioner Pearson questioned the utility of deferring the project yet again, given that the applicant has said they will not redesign again. Chairman Klaus said that he did not disagree. Commissioner Bond pointed out that a denial could be appealed, but not a deferral.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that he would hope the intent was to design a good project and get it completed, rather than go through the trouble of the appeal process.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if an approval with conditions might be a good idea, given the points raised.

Commissioner Hendricks withdrew the motion.

The applicant requested clarification about the requested simplification of materials, whether the Commission has a preference between metal and the cementitious panels. Commissioners Bond and Hendricks suggested that the metal is preferable.

Chairman Klaus thanked the applicants for their patience with the lengthy review process.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the materials be simplified on the exterior; the railing be inset from the top of the interstitial space; the new stair tower be physically differentiated with an inset from the existing stair tower; the stagger between the residential units be removed; the roof of the corner tower be redesigned to appear thinner; the window and door final specifications, including design and materials, be submitted for review and approval, and be reflected on the building permit plans in a door and window schedule; the lighting specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval; and any additional items not included in the application, including upgrades to an existing parking lot and any proposed signage, be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 4 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

**No --** 2 - Commissioner Sanford Bond and Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks

- 12 [COA-050743-2019](#) 101 North 29th Street- Amend previously approved plans to alter the porch enclosure and garage.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)  
[Application and Plans \(3/26/2019\)](#)  
[Site Map](#)  
[Staff Report \(3/26/2019\)](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Staff recommended the following originally approved details be maintained in the design: a metal cable railing along the garage parapet wall. Staff recommended approval of the following with conditions: change in fenestration size of the first story porch enclosure windows, with the condition that the applicant work with staff to add additional glazing or raise the level of the faux railing to meet the window sill; relocation of the door and a solid wall on the garage addition with the condition that the door specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the new awning on the rear elevation, with the condition that

it be mounted directly into the mortar joints, not the historic masonry; removal of the railing on the second story, with the condition that a horizontal design element, such as metal trim to match the vertical trim between the existing and new brick, be placed below the window sills on the second story East Franklin Street elevation; a brick parapet wall on the garage addition at the same height as the revised first floor faux railing; the vertical trim piece between the historic and new construction, with the details to be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Chairman Klaus asked for clarification about the deployment of the cable railing. Ms. Jones stated that the use of the cable railing would be as originally approved, in place of brick, and would enable bringing the parapet wall down to its historic height.

Chairman Klaus stated he would prefer the addition of transom windows over increasing the height of the railing on the side elevation.

Commissioner Hendricks asked for clarification about what had changed from previous designs, specifically regarding windows. Ms. Jones stated that staff has requested dimensioned elevations, and the applicants have indicated that they will be able to provide them. This will help to clarify and confirm design details.

Ms. Mullen, speaking on behalf of the applicant Ms. Freund, stated that the railing referred to was part of the balcony from a previous submission which was not approved. Commissioner Hendricks stated that he had been referring to the small "faux railing" on the side of the balcony, below the window.

Ms. Mullen stated that the guidance from the March meeting had been to simplify the design. Ms. Mullen stated that the applicant agreed with all of staff recommendations. Ms. Mullen said that the applicant could work on moving the railing up to compensate for the 7-foot windows in the 8-foot window openings.

Chairman Klaus stated that it has been determined only recently that the second story balcony and a door were added in 1979. Chairman Klaus stated that, though the applicant has said they cannot find windows large enough for the 8-foot openings, it should be possible to put in a transom above them.

Commissioner Bond asked if the railing, where the porch used to be, is accessible. Chairman Klaus stated that it is not, and that the railing is a decorative detail to indicate where the porch used to be. Commissioner Bond asked about the lower railing; Chairman Klaus stated that it was there historically, as opposed to the upper railing which dates from 1979.

Ms. Freund stated that an earlier version of this application had had transoms above the windows, and that the applicants were told at that time to not include the transoms, as they are non-historical for the neighborhood. Ms. Freund stated that the applicants' research indicates that 8-foot windows have problems with their mechanism and with wind shear, whereas 6-foot or 7-foot ones tend to be less problematic. Ms. Freund stated that there is no way to shade a transom window, and that with the southern exposure this will tend to heat up the building considerably.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Chairman Klaus stated that the Commission received five letters from the public – from neighbors and from the Church Hill Neighborhood Association -- all in opposition to the current application.

Hearing no public comment, Chairman Klaus opened the floor for a Commission motion

and discussion.

Chairman Klaus stated that the glazing, which is a matter of concern to him, would be reviewed by himself and Commissioner Hendricks as part of an administrative review process. Commissioner Hendricks expressed concern that raising the railing would significantly alter the proportions; Chairman Klaus agreed, but emphasized that in the administrative approval process this would be changed from what is currently submitted, and a solution amenable to the Commission could be arrived at.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: a metal cable railing be used along the garage parapet wall; the applicant work with staff to add additional glazing or raise the level of the faux railing to meet the window sill; the garage door specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the new awning on the rear elevation be mounted directly into the mortar joints, not the historic masonry; a horizontal design element, such as metal trim to match the vertical trim between the existing and new brick, be placed below the window sills on the second story East Franklin Street elevation; a brick parapet wall on the garage addition at the same height as the revised first floor faux railing; the applicant submit details of the gutter and downspouts for staff review and approval; and the details of the vertical trim piece between the historic and new construction be submitted to staff for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 6 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

- 13** [COA-053588-2019](#) 106 East Clay Street - Rehabilitate an attached single-family home, to include rebuilding a rear porch and porch enclosure.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jeffries presented this application.

Staff recommended approval of the proposal, with the following conditions: a full window survey be conducted if any windows require replacement; details on a proposed replacement product that meets the Commission's Guidelines be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the rear windows visible from the public right of way be 6/6 windows with true or simulated divided lights; the rear door openings be enclosed from the interior in a manner that could be reversed in the future and maintains the exterior appearance of the entrances; a site plan with the location of the HVAC units be submitted for administrative review and approval; the roof of the new enclosure align with the porch enclosure on the attached structure and the design be modified to reference the historic porch by adding a horizontal element between the stories; the new rear porch be constructed of wood, be painted or stained a neutral color to be administratively approved by staff, and utilize a Richmond Rail. Staff recommended denial of the installation of exterior vinyl windows.

Chairman Klaus requested clarification about the rear porch roof alignment. Ms. Jeffries explained that the roof line referred to is on the attached structure.

Commissioner Wheeler requested clarification about enclosure materials, and whether they would be the same as the porch. Ms. Jeffries stated that the porch would be wood and that she believed the enclosure would be fiber cement.

The applicant introduced himself and his partner in 721 Clay LLC, Justin Freeman.

Mr. Freeman stated that they were in agreement with the staff recommendations. Mr. Cluff stated that they could upon request employ a company to recommend specific mortar for the project, and that they could provide this information to the Commission.

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: a full window survey be conducted to determine if any windows require replacement with details on a proposed replacement product that meets the Commission's Guidelines be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the rear windows visible from the public right of way be 6/6 windows with true or simulated divided lights; the rear door openings be enclosed from the interior in a manner that could be reversed in the future and maintains the exterior appearance of the entrances; a site plan with the location of the HVAC units be submitted for administrative review and approval; the roof of the new enclosure align with the porch enclosure on the attached structure and the design be modified to reference the historic porch by adding a horizontal element between the stories; and the new rear porch be constructed of wood, be painted or stained a neutral color to be administratively approved by staff, and utilize a Richmond Rail. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 5 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Mitch Danese

**Abstain --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

- 9 [COA-053433-2019](#) 2216 Venable Street - Rehabilitate an existing, semi-attached single-family residence, construct a two story rear addition.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application. The applicant was not present. Commissioner Sanford Bond recused himself and left the meeting at 6:20 PM.

Staff recommended partial approval of the application, with the following conditions: staff recommended denial of the demolition of the rear section of the building; the massing and size of the addition be redesigned to be more subordinate to the existing building; the siding on the addition be smooth and unbeaded, in a color to be approved by staff; the addition have a consistent fenestration pattern with vertically aligned windows on the visible elevations; the location of the HVAC equipment be shown on a site plan, and details for how the equipment will be screened if it is determined to be visible from the street or alley be submitted to staff for review and approval; site improvements – including fences, paving, or regarding to address drainage – be submitted for administrative review and approval; the specifications for the replacement windows and doors be submitted for

staff review and approval; any proposed repairs to the porch, including materials, be submitted to staff for review and approval.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to defer the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the plans per the staff report recommendations. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 5 - Commissioner Gerald Jason Hendricks, Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Mitch Danese

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

## **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

- 15 [COA-053597-2019](#) 2301 Venable Street - Construct a new detached single-family home on a vacant lot.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Staff made the following recommendations: the applicant utilize Model A which features vertically aligned openings on the façade; the applicant utilize masonry on the exterior to be compatible with the original materials in the surrounding area; the applicant redesign the roof to lower the rear profile; the applicant use a less visually intrusive gutter profile. Staff requested that the following should be submitted for final review: a fully dimensioned context site plan and context elevation; a window schedule with material specifications that meet the Guidelines; the location of the HVAC equipment and information about any screening.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment.

The applicant, Lawrence Williams, introduced himself as an architect representing the Maggie Walker Land Trust. Mr. Williams stated that he would comply with what the Commission recommends, and that the current project is to be affordable housing, and hopefully will serve as a template for similar future projects.

Mr. Williams stated that the owner is concerned about the recommended use of brick for the house, as it would reduce the size. Mr. Williams stated that the design compromise between old and new of a brick chimney was in an earlier version of the plans.

Mr. Williams made remarks in favor of diversity and mentioned wishing to use durable materials in the proposed design to "terminate the street." He stated that the applicants would use 3/3 window configuration if that was what the Commission chose.

Mr. Williams stated, as a defense of using siding instead of brick, that there are buildings in Church Hill with siding. Mr. Williams stated that a neighboring house with jagged brick had therefore a lower profile but was not deemed by Mr. Williams to be visually appealing by comparison with his proposed design. Mr. Williams added that a lower roof profile causes more maintenance issues.

Mr. Williams stated that the porches are quarter-size because these are more

economical to build and are less conducive to people gathering.

Commissioner Hendricks pointed out that closing one of the back gates will be difficult as it is shown in the plans.

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment. Commissioner Hendricks stated that one public comment letter was received.

Commissioner Hendricks stated that because of nearby wood frame houses, he would be comfortable with the proposed use of wood; recommended lowering the rear roof slope so that it reads as secondary; and that design version A would be preferable, as fitting better with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he is okay with the use of wood, and with the roof design; that he would prefer 1/1 as opposed to multiple lights for the windows; that he liked the proposed window size, and suggested turning the corner with this, since the lot is on a corner.

Commissioner Wheeler recommended a more symmetrical window arrangement; getting rid of the shutters; making the columns less bulky.

Chairman Klaus stated that, though the area is mostly brick, the applicant could use wood for this project. Chairman Klaus recommended that the windows on the side elevations be larger; that design A be used; and that the applicant revisit the roof line. Chairman Klaus mentioned that the brick chimney idea mentioned by the applicant could be a good one.

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

- 16 [COA-053604-2019](#) 519 St. James Street - Construct a new single-family home on a vacant lot.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Ms. Jones presented this application.

Ms. Jones mentioned that there is an additional vacant lot adjacent, upon which construction can reasonably be anticipated, though there is as yet no plan for that.

Staff recommended that: the applicant remove the cornice line bracket detail; a smooth parge coat be used on the left side elevation for a more finished presentation; a more consistent fenestration pattern be utilized on the alley elevation. Staff requested that the following be submitted for final review: a window schedule with updated material specifications that meet the Guidelines; the location of the HVAC equipment and information about any screening; any site improvements, including a fence; a detailed context elevation.

The applicant, Gregory Shron, stated that the challenge of this project was designing for a very small lot, and that his response was to make the house 3 stories, with the 3rd story set back with a rooftop terrace to add an outdoor living space.

Mr. Shron stated that this building form was popular when he used it in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Shron stated that the submitted design is somewhat more modern in response to Commission feedback of a project reviewed a few months past, and that he would be amenable to simplifying the lines further by removing the cornice line as per staff recommendations.

Mr. Shron stated that, for the firewall side, he was hoping to come to an agreement on a double house with the owner of the neighboring lot.

Commissioner Hendricks recommended that Mr. Shron refer to the 3-story house at Leigh and Adams as an example of a clean, modern aesthetic that is effective in a historic neighborhood and that has been approved by the Commission. Commissioner Hendricks stated that, though most houses in the area are of two stories, he would be okay with the 3 stories up front if the applicant wished to put the balcony or terrace in back; and that he concurred with staff recommendation about eliminating the cornice line.

Chairman Klaus stated that he would prefer a house with more of a 2 ½-story appearance, a mansard with two dormers. He suggested that the applicant put the deck / terrace / balcony in back and the third-floor room the front, front decks not being part of the local vernacular.

Chairman Klaus stated that he felt the front façade could look better, but had no specific suggestions.

Commissioner Hendricks suggested that the applicant look at the 29th Street-Franklin Street block for examples of what Chairman Klaus was describing. Commissioner Wheeler added that there are other examples near the already-mentioned house at Leigh and Adams.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he liked the overall design, but that the back railing is too traditional in appearance. Commissioner Wheeler questioned the ornament on the top piece.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed ambivalence as to whether the 3rd-story terrace would be better in front or in back; suggested enlarging the horizontal window on the side elevation; suggested possibly using casement windows, as being more modern, rather than the double-hung; and suggested avoiding K-style gutters.

Chairman Klaus asked if the applicant expected to know the status of the adjoining lot – whether it could become part of a double house – by the next meeting. Mr. Shron stated that that was his intention, and that doing the project in conjunction with the neighbor was the plan from the beginning.

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

## **Adjournment**

Chairman Klaus adjourned the meeting at 7:02 PM.