



City of Richmond

City Hall
900 East Broad Street

Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, May 26, 2020

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room (Virtual Meeting)

This Meeting will be held through electronic communication means.

This meeting will be held through electronic communication means pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 2020-093, adopted April 9, 2020. This meeting will be open to participation through electronic communication means by the public and closed to in-person participation by the public. Less than a quorum of Richmond City Commission of Architectural Review members will assemble for this meeting in the 5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall at 900 East Broad Street in Richmond, Virginia 23219, and most Commission members and other staff will participate by teleconference/videoconference via Microsoft Teams.

Special Guidelines for Public Access and Citizen Participation:

To access or participate, or both, in the Commission of Architectural Review meeting on Tuesday, May 26, 2020 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES 2020.016](#) Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review

Attachments: [Public Access and Participation Instructions -COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW](#)

Audio of the meeting will be streamed live online at the following web address: <https://richmondva.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. To listen to the meeting's live stream at the web address provided, find and click the link that reads, "In Progress" in the farthest right hand column entitled, "Video". Interested citizens who wish to speak will be given an opportunity to do so by following the outlined in the Public Access and Participation Instructions - Commission of Architectural Review document.

Citizens are encouraged to provide their comments in writing to carey.jones@richmondgov.com in lieu of speaking through audio or video means during the meeting. When submitting your comments by email, be sure to include in your email (i) your full legal name, (ii) any organizations you represent, and (iii) any economic or professional relationships that would be affected by the approval of the application on which you are commenting. The person responsible for receiving written comments is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. All written comments received via email prior to 12:00 p.m. (noon) on Tuesday, May 26, 2020, will be provided to all members of the Commission of Architectural Review prior to the beginning of the meeting and will be included in the record of the meeting.

Call to Order

Chairman James Klaus called the business portion of the May 26 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:34 pm.

Secretary to the Commission, Carey L. Jones, read the announcement for virtual public

meetings: This meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review will be held as an electronic meeting pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance 2020-093. The public has been notified of this meeting and how to participate by a notice in the Richmond Times Dispatch, and an instruction sheet posted with the agenda on the Legistar website. Public comment will be heard for each item on the agenda after the applicant has responded to staff recommendations. Members of the public will be limited to 3 minutes in their comments. The person responsible for receiving comments from the public is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. All Commission members are electronically present using Microsoft Teams, none are physically present in City Hall, and we will be conducting a roll call vote with each member stating their name prior to voting.

Roll Call

Present -- 7 - * Commissioner James W. Klaus, * Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., * Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, * Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, * Commissioner Sean Wheeler, * Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and * Commissioner Mitch Danese

Absent -- 1 - * Commissioner Sanford Bond

Approval of Minutes

April 28, 2020

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Morgan, that the April 28, 2020 Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Mitch Danese

OTHER BUSINESS

Secretary's Report

The Secretary's Report was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones announced that the George Mason Elementary appeal will be heard by City Council this evening.

Ms. Jones also announced that the Commission still needs a Commissioner who is a resident of a City Old and Historic District.

Enforcement Report

Two high-visibility enforcements are still in process: the sign at VUU and painting at the house on Cedar Street.

Commissioner Danese joined the meeting at 3:40 PM.

Elections

Chairman Klaus stated that Commissioners with more than 1 and ½ years left in their terms can contact Ms. Jones if interested in running for office within the Commission; hopefully there will be a lot of interest, and a slate can be ready for the June meeting. Ideally the vice-chair should have sufficient time left in their term that they could if necessary step in as acting Chair when the Chair is away and/or steps down.

Chairman Klaus stated that a position for a CAR member on the UDC Committee is also available. This is not an officer position.

Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones stated that the latest report is lighter than the previous, as it only covers one month. There is nothing in particular to report. There has also been a slow-down in permits.

Chairman Klaus asked if guidelines for solar installations could be discussed. Ms. Jones stated that these sometimes arrive as a permit inquiry, and are usually followed by a site visit to determine the visibility of the equipment. Assuming they are not visible, they are issued an administrative approval, and CAR staff approve the permit. If they are visible, they are reviewed by the Commission.

Other Committee Reports

Chairman Klaus stated that the dissemination of information about UDC meeting items has been going well, and that there will be three items on the next meeting's agenda, none of which is of particular historical interest.

Updates

Ms. Jones stated that it is not yet known whether City Hall will be reopening in June. If it does, there will most likely be occupancy maximums enforced. For this reason and also the non-availability of the conference room for the June meeting, it seems advisable to plan on a virtual meeting.

Ms. Jones stated that this is the second month of electronic plans and staff reports for the meeting. One of this month's sets of plans being visually confusing due to its complexity, Ms. Jones sent an abridged marked-up version to be easier to look at. Ms. Morgan affirmed that this was helpful, and would be helpful in future for big, complicated projects. Ms. Jones stated that she is open to suggestions on other ways of making digital application reviews and meeting proceedings easier.

Chairman Klaus asked if there would be a June quarterly CAR meeting, which Ms. Jones confirmed. Ms. Jones stated that virtual or alternative meeting modes could be explored, including meeting outdoors. Chairman Klaus stated that a virtual meeting seemed fine, and that people are getting used to it, and it might be desirable going forward in general. Commissioner Morgan expressed agreement. Chairman Klaus stated that ease as well as health safety is a factor, and Ms. Jones pointed out that convenience for distant applicants would be an advantage as well. The ordinance currently allows for virtual meetings through September.

Chairman Klaus explained the meeting procedures for listeners: that items on the regular agenda can be moved to the consent agenda for review without discussion, but that even so the public will have an opportunity to comment, and applicants can have their item

kept on the regular agenda if that is their preference.

BUSINESS PORTION OF MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:53PM

The meeting resumed at 3:59 PM.

Secretary to the Commission, Carey L. Jones, read the announcement for virtual public meetings: This meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review will be held as an electronic meeting pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance 2020-093. The public has been notified of this meeting and how to participate by a notice in the Richmond Times Dispatch, and an instruction sheet posted with the agenda on the Legistar website. Public comment will be heard for each item on the agenda after the applicant has responded to staff recommendations. Members of the public will be limited to 3 minutes in their comments. The person responsible for receiving comments from the public is Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review. All Commission members are electronically present using Microsoft Teams, none are physically present in City Hall, and we will be conducting a roll call vote with each member stating their name prior to voting.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Klaus stated that there were no items on the consent agenda, and asked if the Commissioners had any suggestions to add or remove items.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 2nd item, 3631-3633 East Broad Street, to the consent agenda. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye – 6 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr.

Recused – 1 – Commissioner Lane Pearson

Excused – 2 – Commissioner Sanford Bond

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, with Commissioner Johnson seconding, to move the 5th item, 3102 East Grace Street, to the consent agenda, with the alteration that the roof form condition recommended by staff be removed. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Lane Pearson

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Sanford Bond

Chairman Klaus asked if there was any public comment regarding the consent agenda. There was none.

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, that the consent agenda be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

2. [COA-072900-2020](#) 3631 - 3633 E. Broad Street - Construct two new, single-family detached residences.

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

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the applicant update the exterior specifications sheet (A3.1) to indicate the use of wood or aluminum clad wood windows and provide staff with the final window specifications; the applicant utilize a flat-lock metal roof for the porch and submit the final specifications to staff for review and approval; the applicant relocate the downspout to the side of the column so that it is less visibly intrusive. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

5. [COA-072899-2020](#) 3102 E. Grace Street - New construction of a garage in the rear yard.

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

A motion was made by Chairman Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: a different roofing material, rather than the asphalt shingles proposed, be used and specifications be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the garage be clad in a brick that is consistent with but does not match the existing home; a contemporary garage door be installed, and specifications be submitted to staff for administrative approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

REGULAR AGENDA

3. [COA-072961-2020](#) 1830 W. Grace Street - Replace deteriorated wooden windows with composite windows.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Chelsea Jeffries.

The applicant's contractor, Stephen Young with Renewal by Andersen, introduced himself and the applicant, Ms. Dang.

Ms. Dang stated that she wished to return the home as much as possible to its original state. She stated that she wished to replace windows because some of them are very

high, which makes them dangerous to clean and maintain, and that some of the lower windows cannot be opened.

Mr. Young stated that the plans have been adjusted to have wood on the window interiors, instead of the Fibrex as was in the plans submitted. Mr. Young stated that his impression was that aesthetics were the main issue affecting approval, and that his company has provided windows for historic houses. Mr. Young stated that he had thought it would be possible to provide additional pictures during the meeting.

Ms. Jeffries stated that the "chat" function in Microsoft Teams could not be used, and thus was not an option for sharing images.

Chairman Klaus requested clarification about the window composition. Ms. Jeffries stated that the windows themselves are not wood but have wood on the interior. Mr. Young stated that it is not a veneer, but a wood part on the interior instead of Fibrex.

Steve, the sales manager of Richmond Window Corporation introduced himself and stated that the windows in question do not look like vinyl and that they are designed to look and behave like wood, and be paintable like wood. Mr. Young stated that the difference is that the Fibrex product is sturdier and less subject to rot. Chairman Klaus asked if the company offered an aluminum clad window option. Steve stated that they do not, due to the wood and aluminum tending to contract at different rates.

Mr. Page Ewell, owner of the window company, showed an example of the window being suggested, stating that it has historically accurate windows in terms of shape and features, and looks more historically accurate than aluminum clad windows do. Mr. Ewell stated that the company has done projects before that have been approved by the Commission.

Chairman Klaus stated that he himself had Renewal by Andersen windows, the same brand as indicated in this project, and that the vinyl windows being shown are not like the ones that the Commission usually sees and finds problematic. Mr. Ewell stressed that the window model in question is mostly wood.

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

Commissioner Morgan asked if the Commission has a stance on window screens. Ms. Jones stated that window screens have not previously been discussed. Commissioner Wheeler stated that window screens are a building code requirement.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: Windows 105, 106, 107, 207, and 208 be retained and restored; the dimensions of the masonry openings for the visible windows be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a building permit; the new door and transom fit the existing masonry opening without requiring additional trim, and dimensions of the existing brick opening and the proposed door color be submitted for administrative review prior to the installation of the new door; a half-light door be installed in the front, and final drawing and paint color be submitted for administrative approval; an application for the reconstruction of the rear deck and 1-story side porch be submitted for review.

Mr. Ewell asked if the Fibrex windows could be approved going forward. Chairman Klaus stated that this would go beyond the scope of this one project review.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: Windows 105,106, 107, 207, and 208 be retained and restored; the dimensions of the masonry openings for the visible windows be submitted to staff prior to the issuance of a building permit; the new door and transom fit the existing masonry opening without requiring additional trim, and dimensions of the existing brick opening and the proposed door color be submitted for administrative review prior to the installation of the new door; a half-light door be installed in the front, and final drawing and paint color be submitted for administrative approval; an application for the reconstruction of the rear deck and 1-story side porch be submitted for review.

Aye -- 6 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

Abstain -- 1 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler

4. [COA-072895-2020](#) 428 N. Arthur Ashe Boulevard - Exterior alterations to the Virginia Museum of History and Culture, to include minor additions and site improvements.

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

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Chairman Klaus asked if there were guidelines, and if the DHR had any leniency, for dealing with additions to buildings such as the ones in question which are only 30 years old. Ms. Jones stated that she appreciated the Chairman's point and that this had been discussed, but that the guidelines are meant to be applied to all buildings and additions in the historic district, regardless of age.

Commissioner Pearson asked what the reasoning was behind the proposed increase in parking. Ms. Jones stated that some offsite parking is now available, and the applicants are hoping to move it on-site.

Chairman Klaus stated that the back garden was designed by Charles Gillette, and that though not much of its original design remains, the garden area, which is where parking will be added, is of more historic interest than the buildings themselves, and that perhaps the applicant should address this.

Mr. Steven Blashfield of Glavé & Holmes Architecture introduced himself and Jamie Bosket, CEO of the Museum. Mr. Blashfield stated that an adjacent church lot that has been used for overflow parking will no longer be available. Mr. Blashfield stated that attendees at the VMFA, rather than pay to use the VMFA parking deck, often use the VMHC lot because it is free, so this also creates need for increasing on-site parking without taxing on-street parking.

Mr. Blashfield stated that Glavé & Holmes has worked closely with the museum for many years, attempting to design with respect for the history and context of the site, and expressed concern about staff's comments to the effect that old and new components should be differentiated. Mr. Blashfield stated that the limestone, which has been used for multiple additions over time, can easily be identified as to time period due to the patina it

acquires. Mr. Blashfield stated that he had not seen this standard of differentiation of non-historic elements being applied before. Mr. Blashfield stated that all the work being done is to alter components dating only from 1990, thus the applicants do not see a need for differentiation.

Mr. Blashfield stated that due to the preponderance of non-load-bearing glass in the design, a stepback as requested for the meeting room part of the addition would create structural challenges. Mr. Blashfield suggested that a delineating line could be incorporated instead.

Mr. Blashfield stated that the guidelines cited by staff, regarding avoidance of solid materials for enclosures, would be more appropriate for domestic spaces, and that since this is for gallery usage and not a porch, solid walls are needed.

Mr. Blashfield stated that the new sets of railings proposed would match railings which were installed in 2015, and are intended to provide architectural consistency.

In response to Chairman Klaus' remarks about the historic landscaping of the site, Mr. Blashfield stated that there was an extensive rear lawn and formal garden which unfortunately have not been maintained. Mr.

Blashfield stated that the applicants are proposing to move the green space closer to the building to make it more useful and accessible to the public than the current isolated and unused green space surrounded by parking; and that in the proposed new location by the building it is also likely to be better maintained.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the plans indicate salvaged and new limestone, and asked the applicant to clarify. Mr. Blashfield stated that some limestone will be removed and then reused where possible in the façade in the course of the work.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if the applicant saw the current application a phase of a master plan, or more of a redesign in response to design elements not working. Mr. Blashfield stated that there is a master plan, and that previous redesigns have focused on functionalities, adding or enhancing specific functions, including library and archival space, offices for the Department of Historic Resources, expansion of gallery space, and additional collection storage. The 2015 work was to expand the entry area and was not completed to the applicants' satisfaction due to budget constraints. Mr. Blashfield stated that meeting space is in demand by various groups from around the city, and therefore its capacity will be increased.

Mr. Jamie Bosket, the Museum president, stated that the applicants take history seriously, have worked with the Department of Historic Resources who have offices on site, and that they view the current project as a capstone, tying together previous projects. Mr. Bosket stated that the applicants are working with HD Design on the landscaping, and that HD Design has been instructed to take inspiration from the original landscape plan; this will include removing dying magnolia trees and replacing them with new ones. Interpretive panels and hedgerows that mimic historic landscaping will also refer to the early 20th-century landscape elements.

Commissioner Pearson asked what the new parking square footage would be.

Mr. Blashfield stated that there would be roughly a 50% increase in parking spaces, and also a similar amount of increase in green space; there will be an increase in pavement and that he did not know the exact square footage, but that the applicants are attempting to limit the pavement with a more efficient parking layout than the current system.

Chairman Klaus stated, with Ms. Jones providing further detail, that the lighting and

landscape will require review by Land Use staff in order to acquire a Special Use Permit; thus, Land Use and Zoning, both of which have concerns about parking standards, will have input which may result in additional changes. Ms. Jones stated that the site plan could potentially change via the Special Use Permit process.

Commissioner Pearson stated that he had concerns about what the final parking would look like, and stated that splitting the application might make sense, to review the site plan when in a more finalized stated.

Ms. Jones stated that lighting and land use review by Commission and Land Use staff are alluded to in the staff recommended conditions, but that the Commission could amend this to instead require an additional Commission review.

Chairman Klaus expressed agreement with the applicant that the limestone treatment effectively distinguishes different components, and thus staff conditions 1 and 3 regarding the 6 inch indent and the differentiated railings can be dispensed with, and that condition 4 is obviated by the limestone treatment. Chairman Klaus proposed that the condition that the south enclosure be glass should also be removed; and that the final landscaping plan be brought before Commission for a final review.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the new limestone product to be used for the addition should still be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the window and door specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the new masonry be limestone and specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final material specifications and colors be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final lighting and landscaping plans be submitted to the Commission for review and approval; any additional buildings or structures be submitted to the Commission for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Lane Pearson
Excused - 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

Commissioner Morgan stated that the concerns expressed in the one public comment letter which was received could be addressed via the Special Use Permit process. Ms. Jones stated that she had been in contact with the member of the public who submitted the letter, and had apprised them of that process and how they could stay informed of its progress.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the window and door specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the new masonry be limestone and specifications be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final material specifications and colors be submitted to staff for review and approval; the final lighting and landscaping plans be submitted to the Commission for review and approval; any additional buildings or structures be submitted to the Commission for review and approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

6. [COA-072960-2020](#) 2520 E. Broad Street - Replace eight metal combination fixed and awning windows with double-hung composite windows.

Attachments: [Site Map](#)

[Application and Plans \(5/26/2020\)](#)

[Staff Report \(5/26/2020\)](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Chairman Klaus asked if Ms. Jones could provide some background on why this property has such a variety of window types. Ms. Jones indicated that the fixed-glass larger-paned windows on the second floor are new, and date from the building's rehabilitation; their different profile and sash configuration are deliberately intended to differentiate them from the earlier windows. The building's historic windows are metal, with multiple sashes. Chairman Klaus asked if the windows which the applicant, Ms. Sarah Mattingly, wished to change were of the modern type. Ms. Jones stated that the windows the owner has are the size, profile, and materials as the historic windows, as well as staff had thus far been able to figure out.

Chairman Klaus stated that it seemed as if some individual condo owners in the building may have subsequently changed their windows without permission, and that it seemed unusual that individual condo owners within a building could make alterations to window appearance which cause the building to have an inconsistent appearance.

Ms. Sarah Mattingly, the applicant, stated that the windows are very tall and are not well suited to emergency exit needs, and the only other exit, the apartment door, is accessible only via a long hallway. Ms. Mattingly stated that another resident condo-owner in the building had told Ms. Mattingly that she had been able to replace her windows with an Andersen window product with CAR staff approval; based on this, Ms. Mattingly had looked for a replacement window of a conventional sash type, not of a type closely resembling what she currently has.

Ms. Mattingly stated that her windows that are on Broad Street are completely different, whereas her windows are straight glass with no casement.

Ms. Mattingly stated that she understood staff's concern about the windows, and that maybe to allow air flow one of the windows on the front, which date from about 2005, could have a casement attached, which would make it match the rest of the building.

Thus far Ms. Mattingly's research has not turned up a way to turn the middle window into a casement without ruining the historic appearance. Ms. Mattingly stated that the windows are not original, being from a manufacturer that only dates as early as the 1960s; she also stated that she is not confident there is a way to remove the windows and then put them back, due to the way they are bolted in.

Ms. Mattingly stated that the windows which can be opened are not original.

Ms. Mattingly stated that the interior storm windows are not removable due to being screwed in. Ms. Mattingly stated that she is concerned that changing just the middle window would make it difficult to then put storm windows over that set of windows. Ms. Mattingly stated that she is now considering either an aluminum or an approvable

composite window, attempting to match the current windows in appearance. Ms. Mattingly stated that much of the building's visibility is blocked by the Sun Trust bank.

Chairman Klaus questioned Ms. Mattingly about the neighbor whom she had mentioned, who replaced their windows with an Andersen product. Ms. Mattingly stated that they were second-floor windows which face onto 25th Street, and that they seem to be the same size as Ms. Mattingly's windows.

Ms. Mattingly stated that she hoped to arrive at an affordable solution for the windows.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to defer the application for the reasons cited in the staff report to allow the applicant the opportunity to work with staff to research other potential treatment options.

Chairman Klaus asked if the Commission wished to give guidance to the applicant in regard to the metal replacement window option she had mentioned that she was considering, and whether the Commission wished to encourage her to seek a window design that mimics the existing, or whether replacing one bay of the three bays might be a better option. Chairman

Klaus stated that replacing only a middle window, if feasible, might be a good option due to being less expensive.

Ms. Mattingly stated that she is concerned about removing the windows due to the way they are bolted in, and stated that her window contractor stated that a casement design would be bigger and therefore worse than the existing.

Ms. Mattingly said that she had not been able to find any examples of people having done alterations to this kind of window.

Commissioner Morgan asked if the request to replace the windows was based on the need to be able to open them more easily. Ms. Mattingly stated that emergency egress was the concern, and that currently the windows cannot be opened, but that the high window positioning was part of the problem with emergency egress.

Ms. Mattingly asked if the 2-bay window design which had been approved for her neighbor could be an option for her as well. Chairman Klaus stated that the applicant's 3-bay windows were the important ones for her emergency exit purposes, and would require a different solution than what her neighbor had arrived at for their 2-bay window.

Chairman Klaus stated that further research with window specialists might reveal more options, to then bring back to the Commission. Ms. Mattingly stated that she would prefer an option that preserves the current appearance, and had spoken to one company that said they could install a casement that would swing out lower, while preserving the external appearance.

Commissioner Wheeler recommended Graham as a brand to look into for replacement windows. Ms. Mattingly stated that she had contacted them, but that they only work on large projects.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to defer the application for the reasons cited in the staff report to allow

the applicant the opportunity to work with staff to research other potential treatment options. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

1. [COA-072896-2020](#) 2400 Venable Street - Rehabilitate an existing mixed-use building including partial demolition and construction of a front and rear addition.

Attachments: [Site Map](#)

[Application and Plans](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

The contractor, Mike Thomas, stated that there are no windows in the building to be repaired or replaced, and that the front and back additions are beyond repair and he would like to tear them down and reuse the bricks to rebuild them, in the same footprint they currently occupy.

Chairman Klaus asked if the applicant was okay with all the staff recommendations.

Mr. Thomas stated the back chimney is falling off the roof, and that the door plan for upstairs is in the middle of one of the apartments, and is not really visible from the street.

Mr. Thomas stated that [for the back chimney] a fake chimney could be built using the existing bricks, but he stated that he would prefer to get rid of it. Mr. Thomas stated that the applicants would attempt to make the front handrail wood as requested, but that for accessibility metal might be required.

Ms. Katie Thomas, the building owner, introduced herself, and stated that she agreed with Mr. Thomas regarding the rear chimney and its limited visibility. Ms. Thomas disagreed regarding the deck, stating that decks of various sizes are being approved to be added to buildings in the area. Ms. Thomas stated that the windows are gone, except for some 1/1 windows in the front, and the question is whether to use those as the pattern for the rest of the windows being installed in the building. Ms. Thomas requested clarification regarding desired size and light configuration of windows, as to whether a match with or a differentiation from the intact historic windows was desired.

Ms. Jones stated that some windows are there on the building, and were seen in photographs. Ms. Jones stated that staff has photos indicating historic window patterns and will work with the applicants to ensure that replacement windows match the historic fenestration. Chairman Klaus stated that these window selections could be approved via administrative approval, and should not require an additional review by the Commission.

Mr. Thomas stated that the roofline of the building is complicated and has been built onto a couple times, and that it will not be possible to reframe the roof while making allowance for drainage.

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

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he did not see a problem with the roof form, but was

concerned about Mr. Thomas's statement that the applicant was demolishing and rebuilding, as this was not the phrasing in the application.

Chairman Klaus pointed out that, even with an alteration to the roof form, the Commission is stating that the chimney in the middle of the roof is to be retained.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the plans be revised to accurately show the fenestration pattern and design prior to the issuance of a building permit; the new first story front door fit within the existing masonry opening, utilizing sidelights and a transom if necessary, and specifications for the proposed door be submitted for administrative approval; the storefront design be further revised to be consistent with historic patterns, such as by extending the columns to the ground and constructing the bulkhead of wood panels rather than brick; the rear balcony be painted or stained a neutral color and the depth be reduced to eight feet to be more consistent with historic patterns found in the district; the front balcony railing be wood, and painted a color complementary to the main building; specifications for the proposed ramp and handrail to the front entrance be submitted for administrative approval; if the applicant determines that window replacement may be required, a full window survey be submitted for review and approval prior to the removal of any windows; the reconstructed window on the west elevation be a 6/6 wood or aluminum clad wood window with simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar between the glass, be aligned with the window above, and the wood sill be recreated, to match the other first story window openings; final window specifications be submitted for administrative approval; any repointing be done in accordance with the Commission's Maintenance and Repair guide for masonry and the National Park Service's Preservation Brief #2; if the masonry requires repainting, any damaged or deteriorated paint be removed by hand to the next sound level of paint prior to repainting; the new second story front door fit the historic opening and be of a contemporary design; paint colors be submitted for administrative approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 7 - Commissioner James W. Klaus, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lawrence Pearson and Commissioner Mitch Danese

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

There are no items for Conceptual Review

Adjournment

Chairman Klaus stated a reminder about the Commission vacancies, including the position for a resident in a City Old and Historic District, and the upcoming quarterly meeting in July.

Meeting adjourned at 6:02 pm.