



City of Richmond

City Hall
900 East Broad Street

Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

Tuesday, July 28, 2020

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

This meeting was held through electronic communication means.

This meeting was 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, June 23, 2020 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES.20 20.050](#) 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, June 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

Chairperson Neville Johnson called the July 28 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:31 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. The public may participate in the meeting by calling *67-804-316-9457 and entering 201-932-327#. 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 for their comments.

The person responsible for receiving the comments from the public is me, Carey L. Jones, Secretary to the Commission of Architectural Review.

Commission members are electronically present, none are physically present in City Hall.

We will be conducting a roll call vote with the Secretary stating each Commissioners name prior to voting.

Roll Call

Commissioner Danese joined the meeting a few minutes into the Secretary's Report; Commissioner Bond joined the meeting at approximately 3:40 PM; and Commissioner Brewer joined the meeting at 3:43 PM.

All members of the Commission of Architectural Review participated by electronic communication means.

Present -- 8 - * Commissioner Sanford Bond, * 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

OTHER BUSINESS

Secretary's Report

The Secretary's Report was provided by Commission Secretary Ms. Carey Jones.

Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones reported about a porch and railing in Jackson Ward about which a complaint was received from a neighbor. Planning staff worked closely with the property owner, and what started as a violation was brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

Responding to inquiries about repair work on West Broad Street, Ms. Jones stated that, of potential applicants from that area, planning staff has so far only worked with the owner of the property containing a Rite Aid, at the corner of West Broad Street and Belvedere.

Regarding the Permits Report, Ms. Jones pointed out that there are a few new construction projects which have received Commission approval, including 962-964 Pink Street and 2200-2202 M Street.

National Association of Preservation Commissions Annual Conference

Ms. Jones stated that the annual National Association for Preservation Commissions conference would be occurring in virtual form the following week, and would deal with topics such as guideline updates, revising ordinances, developing an archaeological ordinance, substitute materials, and planning for climate change. Ms. Jones stated that the planning staff would be attending and would report back. Ms. Jones stated that registration is \$100, which is less than usual, and that past conferences have been worthwhile.

Richmond 300

Ms. Jones stated that members of PDR staff working on the Richmond 300 Master Plan wished to extend their thanks to Commission members for their feedback on the draft plan. Staff working on the Master Plan will be incorporating more feedback than expected, which will push back the timeline of completion slightly. A draft is expected hopefully sometime in September. Ms. Jones invited Commissioners to pass along any questions or comments on the Master Plan to her, stating that she would be happy to pass them along.

Commission Membership

Ms. Jones stated that she believed one candidate had applied for the vacant position on the Commission of Architectural Review. They would first have to be approved by the Land Use, Housing and Transportation subcommittee of the City Council, then by the full Council. Factoring in that the City Council takes a recess in August, this process would probably not be completed until sometime in September or October.

Virginia Museum of History and Culture Project Update

Ms. Jones stated that she would be meeting on July 29 with Land Use staff and personnel from the Virginia Museum of History and Culture to discuss the proposed amendment to a Special Use Permit. Ms. Jones stated that she had not yet seen updated plans for this project, but hopefully would at the meeting; and that she would share an update on this project at the August Commission meeting.

Approval of Minutes

May 26, 2020

Commissioner Pearson had one correction to these minutes regarding an item from which he recused himself, which Ms. Jones stated would be added before finalization.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Wheeler, that the May 26, 2020 Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Excused -- 2 - Commissioner Sanford Bond and Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

June 23, 2020

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Danese, that the June 23, 2020 Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer

Chair Johnson pointed out the City Attorney Neil Gibson's presence at the meeting and explained that he was present in case the Commission wished to discuss Monument Avenue. Chair Johnson stated that, due to a lack of any proposal or paper to review, he would not recognize such a discussion at this time. Chair Johnson asked that, as a procedural matter, if Commissioners had any questions for the City Attorney, those should be directed to Ms. Jones, who could then address them along with the City Attorney.

Commission Chair Johnson announced his intention to assemble a two-member Commission subcommittee for procedures and related matters, to address changes to procedures, including the new fees, and how to make plan submittal guidelines clear to the public. Chair Johnson stated that he had spoken with a number of Commissioners about this already, and would be exploring the idea further in the next few weeks. Commission Chair Johnson stated that, once it is formed, he would like the Committee to be in existence for 90 days, concluding its work by the end of this time period.

Commissioner Brewer joined the meeting at 3:43 PM.

Commission Chair Johnson explained for members of the public the procedure for review of applications during the regular portion of the meeting.

Commission Chair Johnson adjourned the business portion of the meeting at 3:45 PM.

CONSENT AGENDA

The regular portion of the meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the Commissioners had any suggestions to add or remove items for the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 3rd item, 2520 East Broad Street, to the consent agenda. Commissioner Klaus stated that he agreed with staff regarding this application, and that replacing the bedroom windows as proposed would enhance safety, while the living room windows do not require replacement and could instead be repaired.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he had been curious about apparent alterations to some other windows at the property, some of which are on the Broad Street side, and wondered about the back story. Ms. Jones stated that, from the records, it appears that the existing metal windows were designed to replicate the original windows, and that the

windows on the second floor of the elevation referred to in the application are new windows which were installed in non-original window openings, with a different design to indicate that they were new.

Commissioner Wheeler asked what would happen if the owners of the floor above expressed safety concerns similar to those of the applicant. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the context of the windows has already lost much of its meaning due to assorted revisions. Commissioner Wheeler pointed out that the building has a storefront which appears to have mullions with a cumbersome window arrangement with simulated divided lites, and stated that he felt hesitant to add to the mix of styles and designs without knowing the full story of the historical development.

Commissioner Pearson requested clarification as to whether approving this item on the consent agenda would mean complying with staff recommendations, or if it would mean approving the application as submitted. Commissioner Klaus stated that it would mean the former, and Chair Johnson explained further that, if Commissioners did not wish to move item 3 from the regular agenda, they should vote against the current motion.

The motion failed by the following vote:

Aye – 3- Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

No - 4 – Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Sean Wheeler

Excused – 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

Commissioner Bond was absent from this vote due to a technical issue.

Commissioner Wheeler asked, regarding item 1 on the agenda, 2314 Jefferson Avenue, about the reasoning behind staff recommendation to not paint the modern-seeming metal canopy detail. Ms. Jeffries stated that the detail in question, even though it may be recently installed and contemporary in appearance, is considered a character-defining feature for the style. Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement with this assessment, the style in question being Moderne, for which chrome details are a common component.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment regarding the consent agenda items.

Ms. Jodi Dubyoski, the architect for the 2314 Jefferson Avenue project, stated that she was not clear on the meaning of the staff's recommended condition regarding making the garage door more closely resemble the existing design. Commissioner Morgan asked Ms. Jones if there were any examples that could be provided for Ms. Dubyoski of storefront systems in the district that include pedestrian doors and loading doors. Ms. Jones stated that she could not think of a specific example, but that there have been numerous commercial conversions in the city which can be referred to in order to work out specifications of the desired change. Ms. Jones stated that she would be happy to work with the applicant on revisions in order to satisfy this condition. Ms. Morgan stated that incorporating a take-out window into a storefront system is tricky, and mentioned a storefront not in the district, on 14th Street, which has a loading door with a pedestrian door in it, and which she stated could potentially be a helpful example for the applicant.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Danese, 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

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

1. [COA-075845-2020](#) 2314 Jefferson Avenue - Install a painted sign and install a new store front in an existing garage door opening.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the metal canopy coping remain unpainted; the applicant work with staff to determine the final location of the dumpster; the span of fence along North 24th Street be painted or stained, and colors to be administratively approved; the new storefront design be revised to more closely resemble the existing garage door design, and revised plans be submitted to staff for administrative 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

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

2. [COA-075152-2020](#) 2336 Monument Avenue - Replace slate on a side porch roof with synthetic slate.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Danese, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: The synthetic slate product have a subtle color variation, and final color specifications be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval.

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

Excused -- 1 - Commissioner Sanford Bond

REGULAR AGENDA

3. [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.

Commissioner Morgan asked whether the original historic window design for the building is known, and whether the windows being reviewed for this project are the historic windows. Ms. Jones stated that documentation indicates that the current configuration is the historic window configuration. Commissioner Morgan stated, referring to Commissioner Wheeler's comments that the historic windows seem to be in the minority on the building.

Commissioner Danese asked if the condominium documents had been reviewed to determine whether the windows are considered common elements, and which entity – the association or the individual owners – should be dealt with for an application of this kind. Ms. Jones stated that the condo documents had not been reviewed, but suggested that the condominium owner could respond to that question.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if, hypothetically, an identical review would be done for the windows located above the applicants' windows, and expressed concern that what is now not a typical request could become typical. Commission Chair Johnson stated that, from perusing the building in person, he had discerned that there seem to be a number of windows on the lower levels that have the awning pop-out design. Ms. Jones stated that, as well as can be determined from old photographs, it appears that many of the historic windows did have the awning pop-out design. Ms. Jones stated that the building was added onto during the time that it was still a factory.

Commission Chair Johnson pointed out that the staff recommendations only permit alteration to the bedroom windows, not the other historic windows on the front.

Commissioner Morgan asked if the proposed new windows were composite or metal. Ms. Jones clarified that they would be metal, and that the previous application had been for composite windows.

Ms. Mattingly, the applicant, stated that she was certain that all of her existing windows are not original because of the label on the panes that swing out, identifying them as tempered glass dating from 1969 or after, and because they have different frames than the other windows on the first floor of the building. Ms. Mattingly stated that the windows above do not match the other windows is because they are not original to the building.

Ms. Mattingly stated that a previous staff approval for a double-hung window was explained to her by staff as being difficult to see; Ms. Mattingly stated that her windows are visible from Broad Street, but are blocked from view on the 25th Street side by a Sun Trust bank building.

Ms. Mattingly expressed concern that if staff recommendations are followed, she would end up with three different kinds of windows, though she stated that the differences may not be apparent to a casual observer. Ms. Mattingly stated that the living room windows are constructed and installed in such a way that they would be scary to repair, and are

not energy-efficient.

Ms. Mattingly stated that her understanding of why the windows of the building are so varied is that it used to be three different buildings, and that at some point they were combined into one.

Ms. Mattingly stated that she had attempted to contract with the window company Graham, but that her job was of too small scale for their consideration.

Regarding Commissioner Danese's earlier question about which entity has charge of building alterations, Ms. Mattingly stated that the tenants of the condominiums are responsible for their own windows.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if Ms. Mattingly's unit has a sprinkler system. Ms. Mattingly stated that it does, but that the emergency exit is down a long hallway. Commission Chair Johnson asked if she would be able to exit in emergency from the new proposed windows for which staff has recommended approval. She stated that she would be able to with the new proposed windows, due to the awning portion being lower, but that she could not safely do so with the existing windows.

Commission Chair Johnson 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 Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Morgan, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the proposed window replacement for the two sets of triple windows be painted a color to match the historic windows; and to deny the request to replace the paired window on the southwestern corner of the unit.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he understood Commissioner Wheeler's concern about the chaotic assortment of windows on the building, and expressed hope that in future the institutional memory of the Commission could instill more consistency, and future applicants from this building could be encouraged to take advantage of the work already done by this applicant. Commissioner Klaus stated that he did not wish to penalize the applicant for past renovations with which she was not involved.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that in a sprinklered multi-family building of this kind, with a common exit corridor, there is not a requirement to have an emergency exit from the bedroom, although he stated that he understood the applicant's desire for one. Commissioner Wheeler stated that there will be a large assortment of windows on the building. Commissioner Klaus suggested that a solution would be to amend the motion to allow the applicant to change all three sets of windows to the proposed new design, thus giving more consistency to the window assortment. Commissioner Klaus stated that it may not be so important to preserve the existing windows, as they may be modern, as the applicant suggested.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that, as a counterpoint, in 2005, changes were made to the windows as part of a Historic Tax Credit project. At that time, the National Parks Service determined that the windows in question were original, and awarded tax credits for the developer's work to keep the windows.

Commissioner Brewer asked if there was any clarity as to whether the windows were actually original or not. Ms. Jones stated that, whether they are specifically the original

windows, they were deemed by the Parks Service to replicate the original windows enough to warrant receiving the historic tax credit.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the variety of windows does tell a story of the development of the building, and that the staff recommendations constitute a good compromise.

Ms. Mattingly stated that she did not know the installation date of the existing windows, but conceded that someone could have changed just the panes and not the rest of the window. Ms. Mattingly stated that one of her near neighbors have windows with slightly different details.

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Morgan, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the proposed window replacement for the two sets of triple windows be painted a color to match the historic windows; and to deny the request to replace the paired window on the southwestern corner of the unit.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

No -- 1 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler

4. [COA-075150-2020](#) 2004 W. Grace Street - Alter a side porch and convert a window to a door on the side elevation.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Chelsea Jeffries.

Commissioner Morgan asked if the deck was being extended. Ms. Jeffries stated that the deck would be extended to accommodate the new stairway, and that the railing on that side of the deck would be removed and a new railing installed across the front of the deck.

The applicant, Mr. Chris Grandpre, stated that the proposed alteration is intended to make an easier entrance to the residence from the back, and that the most often used entrance, from the driveway, is currently very constrained. Mr. Grandpre stated that the existing spiral staircase dates from a time when the building was divided into apartments, whereas it is currently a single-family home. Mr. Grandpre stated that plans include removing the staircase and changing a door to a window to allow more light into the kitchen, as well as expanding the deck slightly to facilitate egress.

Mr. Grandpre asked if staff would be able to provide examples to illustrate the differentiation requested between the historic fabric and the new porch construction. Ms. Jeffries stated that there are many options as to what sort of differentiating detail is deployed, and that the objective is to avoid mimicking the historic details or style.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that staff would be able to assist with figuring out

those details. Mr. Grandpre stated that he was comfortable with the changes requested in the staff recommendations.

Commission Chair Johnson 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 Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the infill brick be inset from the existing door jambs, and a wood or aluminum clad wood 1/1 window be installed in the altered opening; the new landing and stairway at the front of the porch be differentiated from the existing construction, details to be submitted to staff for administrative approval.

Commissioner Wheeler asked if staff recommendations called for the new railing to not be Richmond rail, which is the current style. Commissioner Morgan stated that that had been her impression: that the recommendation was for the stairs to be differentiated, so that they do not appear historic, and that one way of doing this would be to change the type of railing. Ms. Jeffries stated that her recommendation was specifically to do with the stairway, not the railing to be installed in the front of the deck, and that the stairway did not appear to be historic.

The motion carried by the following vote:

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Pearson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the infill brick be inset from the existing door jambs, and a wood or aluminum clad wood 1/1 window be installed in the altered opening; the new landing and stairway at the front of the porch be differentiated from the existing construction, details to be submitted to staff for administrative approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 8 - Commissioner Sanford Bond, 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

5. [COA-075153-2020](#) 3509 E. Marshall Street - Construct a single family detached building with accessory garage on a vacant lot.

Attachments: [Application and Plans](#)

[Site Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

Commissioner Pearson stated that he would abstain from review and comment on this application, and left the meeting at this juncture. Commissioner Danese stated that he too would abstain from review and comment, but that he would stay on line to listen in to the application presentation and discussion.

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones stated that no public comment was received prior to the meeting, about this or

any other application reviewed at this meeting.

Commissioner Morgan asked what issue the staff had with the windows; Ms. Jones stated that it was a materials issue.

The applicant, Mr. Gregory Shron, stated that the submitted design was intended as a clean and contemporary interpretation on the typical narrow-lot single-family home for the district, and that he looked forward to the Commission's comments.

Commissioner Klaus asked if the contemporary black railings from a previous, approved application of Mr. Shron's, for 3019-3021 East Marshall Street, would be used in this instance. Mr. Shron stated that they would be.

Commissioner Bond stated that he concurred with staff comments; that he did like the horizontal railing in that it indicates the building is new; and that he appreciated the cleanness and simplicity of the design.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the design is very similar to others that have been approved; and that he agreed with the staff recommendation for more consistent window sizes.

Commissioner Morgan requested to see another property by the same applicant, currently under construction, and stated that she had no particular comments. Commissioner Morgan stated that she had no problem with the varied windows, as they are thoughtfully aligned, nor with the way the windows meet the mansard.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed agreement with the other Commissioners, but cautioned that the garage appeared to have asphalt shingles, which the Commission generally opposes.

Commissioner Brewer stated that she appreciated the application, concurred with staff recommendations, and had no further comments.

Commissioner Morgan stated that there appear to be many brick outbuildings in the area, and stated that she did not want to oppose a garage having siding, but suggested that the roof form could perhaps be altered, i.e., a flat roof, in order to better match nearby outbuildings. Commissioner Morgan stated that a garage should mirror the style of the house it belongs to, and also mirror typical styles in the area.

Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Morgan's garage comment, stating that there is an opportunity to create something different with the garage.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

This Application was Conceptually Reviewed

Adjournment

Commission Chair Johnson expressed gratitude to Commissioner Klaus for his two years of service as Commission Chair. Ms. Jones echoed those sentiments.

Meeting adjourned at 5:14 pm.