



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, November 24, 2020

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

### **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, November 24th, 2020 at 3:30 PM, you have several options outlined in the following document:

[PDRPRES 2020.069](#) Public Participation and Access Information - 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](mailto: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, November 24th, 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**

Commission Chair Neville Johnson called the November 24, 2020 meeting of the Commission of Architectural Review to order at 3:33 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**

- Present --** 8 - \* Neville C. Johnson Jr., \* James W. Klaus, \* Kathleen Morgan, \* Lawrence Pearson , \* Mitch Danese, \* Sean Wheeler, \* Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and \* Sanford Bond
- Excused --** 1 - \* Ashleigh N. Brewer

**Approval of Minutes**

September 22, 2020

**A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, that the September 22, 2020 Meeting minutes be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

- Aye --** 7 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Lawrence Pearson , Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler and Sanford Bond
- Excused --** 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer
- Abstain --** 1 - Coleen Bulter Rodriguez

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Secretary's Report

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

Ms. Jones stated that City Hall would be closed the afternoon of Wednesday November 25 and all day Thursday and Friday, November 26 and 27, for the Thanksgiving holiday.

Ms. Jones stated that the City is in its budget review phase, and the good news is that the departmental funding levels are similar to what they were last year, without any major

cuts anticipated at this time.

Ms. Jones stated that she had fielded several questions about the new ordinance introduced by Councilwoman Kim Gray, to change all of the medians on Monument Avenue into public parks. The City Planning Commission has voted to recommend that two of them become parks at this point and that the remainder remain rights of way. The two medians recommended to be parks already have walking paths and landscaped areas, and thus already function as parks. Ms. Jones stated that she had consulted with the City Attorney, who stated that this does not change the responsibility of CAR and CAR staff regarding any proposed work within those medians, whether they are parks or not.

#### Administrative Approval Report

Ms. Jones stated that the Building Permits Report has items related to Zoning reviews, such as Special Use Permits, Plans of Development, and Re-zonings. These items are beginning to show up in the Permits Report because they are being reviewed by Ms. Chelsea Jeffries and Ms. Jones as part of a mitigation for a Section 106 issue. Ms. Jeffries and Ms. Jones have been attending meetings with Land Use staff and providing input as to whether Section 106 will be required, and also giving design input as requested.

Ms. Jones pointed out that an administrative approval had been issued for 2017 Venable Street, where non-approved roof work had begun. Staff worked closely with the architect for that property to bring it back into compliance.

Ms. Jones pointed out another administrative approval for a large metal roof at 3001 East Broad Street, which is a highly visible location. A roof replacement for this property had been recently reviewed by the Commission. The main roof is currently being replaced, and the lower roofs will most likely be replaced shortly thereafter. Commissioner Wheeler had provided advice to the owners about possible repair materials, which the owners tried but decided against.

Ms. Jones noted that there have been two recent administrative approvals for solar panel installation, and that Commission staff is beginning to see these applications more frequently. Commission staff has been working with high-volume solar panel installers to let them know what information is needed in order to secure approval of permits, which seems to have made those applications move along more efficiently. Ms. Jones stated that Commission staff approves solar panel installations provided that they will not be visible to the public, and suggested that it might be useful to also have an administrative approval option for cases in which the panels will be visible. Commission Chair Johnson asked that guidelines for administrative approvals of visible and non-visible solar panels be added to the agenda for the Commission's next quarterly meeting.

#### Enforcement Report

Ms. Jones stated that Commission staff has been working with property owners on minor enforcement issues, such as the one already mentioned at 2017 Venable Street.

Ms. Jones stated that there has been an increase in Code Enforcement activity on Venable Street, and staff has been working with property owners on Venable Street, as well as with City Code Enforcement and Property Maintenance staff, to address the code violations in a way that does not then result in a CAR Guidelines violation.

Ms. Jones stated that there were two recent painting violations on West Grace Street which the Commission had looked at, and both parties had since been in touch with Ms. Jones about next steps. Ms. Jones stated that a red paint color had been approved for one case, and in the other case Ms. Jones had provided guidance on how to remove already-applied paint. Those violations have still not been remedied and remain a high priority, and Ms. Jones has reached out to both property owners to follow up.

Regarding an outstanding signage violation at Virginia Union University, Ms. Jones stated that the representative from VUU with whom staff had been speaking is no longer in that position, so Ms. Jones has spoken with the new replacement staff person a few times, and has also contacted the City Attorneys about next steps.

Referring back to the ordinance to convert Lee Circle medians to parks, Commissioner Morgan asked for clarification regarding parks in historic districts and whether they tend to be reviewed by CAR or by the Urban Design Committee.

Ms. Jones stated that the current CAR members have not reviewed any applications in parks, but that a previous Commission did review a proposal for Abner Clay Park, and Commission staff have reviewed and approved some permits for work at Abner Clay Park. Ms. Jones stated that the Commission does have responsibilities regarding parks in City Old and Historic Districts, and that her reason for reaching out to the City Attorney was to find out if CAR would now be involved in the medians converted to parks.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the only example he knew of from the past four years was the Commission's review of a proposal for a number of changes that were park-like, at a location between Park Avenue and Monument Avenue.

Ms. Jones stated that she could investigate and report back to the Commission. Ms. Jones stated that the City lawyer had stated that CAR would still have purview over areas in City Old and Historic Districts, regardless of whether they are parks or merely rights of way.

Commission Chair Johnson pointed out that the Commission had received some public comment letters which Ms. Jones had passed along, and which Commissioners could review prior to the start of the regular portion of the meeting.

Commission Chair Johnson adjourned the business portion of the meeting at 3:50 PM.

#### Other Committee Reports

There were no other committee reports.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

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

Ms. Jones re-read the announcement info for virtual meetings.

Commission Chair Johnson explained that there is an order to the meeting, starting with the Consent Agenda, followed by the Regular Agenda, and concluding with the Conceptual Review. At appropriate times, applicants will have an opportunity to speak in regard to their applications.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the Commissioners wished to move any items from

the regular agenda to the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commission Chair Johnson, to move the 6th item, 1630 Pope Avenue, to the Consent Agenda.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 8 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Colleen Butler Rodriguez

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer

A motion was made by Commissioner Klaus, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to move the 4th item, 910-912 N 25th Street, to the Consent Agenda.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 5 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Sanford Bond  
No – Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

Abstaining – 2 - Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commissioner Colleen Butler Rodriguez

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment.

Mr. Bruce Shirley, applicant for 1630 Pope Avenue, stated that the applicants have concerns about the staff recommendations regarding the extension of the side porch, and would like the opportunity to address that.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Klaus, to move the 6th item, 1630 Pope Avenue, back to the regular agenda.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 8 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commissioner Lane Pearson, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Colleen Butler Rodriguez

Excused – 1 – Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer

Mr. Gregory Shron, applicant for the 4th item, stated that he would be comfortable with proceeding with item 4 on the consent agenda.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the consent agenda.

Commissioner Morgan requested that the 4th item, 910-912 N 25th Street, that the railings be set back from the front. Commissioners Wheeler and Bond assented to this amendment.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye – 7 - Commissioner Sean Wheeler, Commission Chair Neville Johnson, Commissioner Kathleen Morgan, Commissioner James Klaus, Commissioner Mitch

Danese, Commissioner Sanford Bond, Commissioner Colleen Butler Rodriguez  
Abstaining – 1 - Commissioner Lane Pearson  
Excused – Commissioner Ashleigh Brewer

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to approve the consent agenda.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler, Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Sanford Bond

**Excused --** 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer

**Abstain --** 1 - Lawrence Pearson

- 1. [COA-081584-2020](#) 2206 E. Broad Street - Convert rear porch roof to a second story balcony.

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

**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: the porch be painted to match the existing porch, or new colors be submitted to staff for administrative approval; details regarding the treatment of the attached porch be submitted for administrative review and approval; the existing posts be retained or replaced in-kind with new square wood posts; a half-round metal gutter be installed, and specifications be submitted for administrative approval; the Richmond rail be wood painted a neutral color found on the Commission palette.**

**Aye --** 7 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler, Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Sanford Bond

**Excused --** 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer

**Abstain --** 1 - Lawrence Pearson

- 2. [COA-081794-2020](#) 5 W. Clay Street - Construct a new carport in the rear lot.

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

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

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler, Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Sanford Bond

**Excused --** 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer

**Abstain --** 1 - Lawrence Pearson

3. [COA-081830-2020](#) 605 N. 21st Street - Construct a rear, two-story, accessory dwelling unit.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

**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: the person door on the east elevation also be wood; specifications for the windows and doors be submitted for administrative approval; the fiber cement siding be smooth and unbeaded.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler, Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Sanford Bond

**Excused --** 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer

**Abstain --** 1 - Lawrence Pearson

4. [COA-081851-2020](#) 910-912 N. 25th Street - Construct two, semi-attached, single-family residences.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

**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: the applicant work with staff to reduce the mass of the partial third story by perhaps reducing the height, massing, and/or inseting it from the side elevations; the third story railing be setback a few feet from the roof edge, details to be submitted to staff for review and approval; the applicant provide additional line of sight drawings from further along 25th Street; the applicant provide final material specifications for review and approval.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 7 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler, Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Sanford Bond

**Excused --** 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer

**Abstain --** 1 - Lawrence Pearson

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

5. [COA-081843-2020](#) 2204 W. Grace - Alter landscape and hardscape design in front, side, and rear yards.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Chelsea Jeffries.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the existing stair did not look as if it was original. Ms. Jeffries stated that this had been staff's assumption as well. Commissioner Klaus stated that, though the Commission generally tries to retain original concrete features, perhaps the applicant could be given more leeway in terms of materials, given the non-original configuration and materials in the rear of the property.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the applicant would like to comment on their application. The applicant did not respond. Ms. Jones stated that she could not be certain if the applicant was electronically present, but that staff had been in touch with the applicant and provided meeting information, including how to join the meeting.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that the Commission would proceed with reviewing the application, and return to it later in the meeting if the applicant makes their presence known.

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

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

A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the front steps be repaired or replaced in-kind with new concrete to match the existing; the concrete walkway to the side yard that is visible from the street be replaced in-kind with new plain concrete; any unpainted concrete remain unpainted, and colors be submitted to staff for administrative approval; specifications for the proposed handrail on the rear stairs be submitted for administrative review and approval; final specifications for the trash enclosure be submitted to staff for administrative approval.

Commissioner Klaus stated that he did not feel strongly that the material in the rear needs to be concrete, and suggested that brick be permitted for the patio and stairs in the back. Commission Chair Johnson and Commissioner Bond approved this revision to the motion.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he did not think the Commission's Guidelines say anything about stained or painted concrete, pointed out that there are two colors in the existing concrete walkway, and asked if these would be matched when it was repaired. Ms. Jeffries stated that the plans specify painted, not stained, concrete. Commissioner Morgan stated that the different colors of the concrete might be due to residue or discoloration; Commissioner Bond stated it could be due to different aggregate being used at different times. Commissioner Johnson expressed agreement with this assessment.

Commissioner Klaus stated that the staff recommendation was to not paint the concrete,

and that the application called for replacing the entire concrete walkway, so that it would all be one color. Ms. Jeffries confirmed this, stating that the plans include sections adjacent to the house next door.

Commissioner Morgan expressed agreement with Commissioner Klaus' amendment to the motion allowing brick in the rear.

Commission Chair Johnson pointed out that the applicant had not been heard from, though their feedback had been elicited. Ms. Jeffries stated that the applicant appeared to be in the meeting but unable to be heard. Ms. Jones asked that the applicant call in instead.

The applicant stated that the staircase is shared with his neighbor, and asked if it and its landing would have to remain concrete when repaired. Commissioner Klaus stated that staff recommendations are that anything visible be concrete. The applicant asked if the parking lot needs to be concrete, or if it could be gravel as requested. Ms. Jeffries stated that staff had no issues with the materials proposed. The applicant asked if pavers could be permitted. Commissioner Morgan asked if this change could be administratively approved, which Ms. Jones confirmed.

Commission Chair Johnson informed the applicant that he would have to secure that administrative approval before proceeding with the pavers, or whatever else is chosen as a paving material.

Ms. Jones clarified that Commission were now allowing the side walkway to be concrete.

**A motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Bond, to partially approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the front steps be repaired or replaced in-kind with new concrete to match the existing; the concrete walkway to the side yard that is visible from the street be replaced in-kind with new plain concrete; any unpainted concrete remain unpainted, and colors be submitted to staff for administrative approval; specifications for the proposed handrail on the rear stairs be submitted for administrative review and approval; final specifications for the trash enclosure be submitted to staff for administrative approval.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye --** 8 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Lawrence Pearson , Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler, Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Sanford Bond

**Excused --** 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer

6. [COA-081541-2020](#) 1630 Pope Avenue - Demolish existing rear deck and construct a new rear addition, deck, and pool house.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jeffries.

Mr. Bruce Shirley introduced himself as project architect and stated that the applicants have no problem with any of the recommendations, except that they would like to keep

the porch roof extension as proposed, stating that it will not be noticeable due to the screening created by shrubs. Mr. Shirley stated that the foliage could be increased and swapped out for evergreens if that would help, and stated that he had submitted a drawing showing an updated plan with more foliage screening and the fence height raised to 8 feet for a portion of its extent. Mr. Shirley asked if there was any way that the porch extension could be retained, stating that the applicants do not feel it is a high profile or imposing feature.

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

A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commission Chair Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new door fit between the existing window jambs and the lintel be maintained; the new siding on the existing porch enclosure be smooth, unbeaded lap siding; the porch roof terminate at the enclosed area and not extend past the north elevation of the existing building; smooth, unbeaded lap siding be used on the pool house; all materials specifications for the outbuilding and house be submitted for administrative approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Commissioner Klaus asked for clarification regarding the location of the bushes, stating that the bushes appear to be where the roof extension would be located, and thus would have to be removed. Mr. Shirley stated that the addition does not extend forward very much from the back of the house but rather goes sideways, and that the applicants plan to remove the bushes in order to move the fence forward but then replace them with new, possibly taller, screening foliage. Commissioner Klaus stated that he did not see a possibility for a 6-foot fence to be of sufficient height to block the view from the street.

Commissioner Klaus stated that an addition is permanent whereas a shrub is not, thus it is difficult to use a shrub as a justification for creating a new architectural feature. Commission Chair Johnson stated that the extension would be visible from the right of way on Hermitage Road, and that this is the concern.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that the deck itself would be less visible and can be extended, but the issue is with the roof, which would be more visible; and also that Zoning regulations do not allow a fence height of 8 feet, thus that is not an option for decreasing the visibility of the proposed roof extension.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Pearson, seconded by Commission Chair Johnson, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the new door fit between the existing window jambs and the lintel be maintained; the new siding on the existing porch enclosure be smooth, unbeaded lap siding; the porch roof terminate at the enclosed area and not extend past the north elevation of the existing building; smooth, unbeaded lap siding be used on the pool house; all materials specifications for the outbuilding and house be submitted for administrative approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye -- 8 - Neville C. Johnson Jr., James W. Klaus, Kathleen Morgan, Lawrence Pearson , Mitch Danese, Sean Wheeler, Coleen Bulter Rodriguez and Sanford Bond**

**Excused -- 1 - Ashleigh N. Brewer**

**CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

7. [COA-081769-2020](#) 2202 Jefferson Avenue - Construct an outdoor dining area and small rear addition.

**Attachments:** [Application and Plans](#)  
[Base Map](#)  
[Staff Reports](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

Commissioner Pearson asked if the existing canopy had been approved by CAR. Ms. Jones stated that as far as she knew it had not been, but also that the canopy had been in place for a long time.

The project architect, Mr. Evan MacKenzie, stated that the fireplace and chimney locations were intended to echo the form of the original and enhance that alignment, but that the applicants would be open to moving them to a less prominent location. Mr. MacKenzie stated that the applicants had been considering different wall materials, and that the alternate wall material suggestions were appreciated.

The owner, Mr. Chris Davis, stated that the applicants are open to recommendations from the Commission. Commission Chair Johnson stated that the staff recommendation was that the project should block less of the view from the public right of way; and that the applicants' stated willingness to comply with that was appreciated.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there was any public comment. Hearing none, he opened the floor for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Bond stated that the proposed canopy structure looked heavy, and that it should be possible to construct it so it has a lighter appearance, contrasting with the blocky character of the building, and so that it blocks less of the view of the restaurant. Commissioner Bond suggested that the fireplace and chimney could also have a lighter feel, and that the chimney could be narrower, as a contrast to the heaviness of the old filling station building. Commissioner Bond suggested that the chimney component could be a round pipe of contemporary appearance, coming out of the fireplace at about mantel height.

Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Bond regarding the canopy structure, that it should be more understated. Commission Chair Johnson stated that the canopy could be a nice outdoor feature but that it should not be the dominant outdoor feature and should not detract from the original structure.

Commission Chair Johnson suggested that the wall could be elaborated or extended to provide a seating element, but that it is important to maintain a comfortable level so that the primary structure remains visible.

Commission Chair Johnson stated that he is not overly concerned about the heaviness of the roof line, because it is high enough not to block visibility of the primary structure behind it. Commission Chair Johnson stated that, with the few modifications recommended by staff, the project would be a great addition to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement with Commissioner Bond, and expressed

concern about the blocking of the gas station building from view. Commissioner Klaus pointed out that the blocking of the view of the view from Jefferson Avenue can be seen in some of the submitted perspective renderings. Commissioner Klaus stated that the original structure's remaining visible from Jefferson Avenue is most important, whereas the visibility from 21st Street, which the plans currently do provide, is less of a priority.

Mr. Davis stated that there had been another concept about the canopy placement and asked if there were any thoughts on that suggestion. The Commissioners stated that they did not have this information and that this other option had not been submitted. Mr. Davis stated that this version might be included in the next submission, and possibly address some issues raised by the Commission.

Commissioner Bond stated that the canopy structure should be light and airy, diaphanous, like a leaf canopy, to counterbalance the solidity of the older building.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that he could see two options for the canopy, either to be lighter or to be heavier, and suggested the applicant go further in one direction or the other, since the light trusses and heavy beams of the submitted design do not go well together. With the heavy beams direction, Commissioner Wheeler suggested a shed roof instead of a gable so as to not require the trusses. Alternatively, the roof pitch could be maintained and a lighter frame be used. Commissioner Wheeler suggested that instead of having a built-in fireplace, a large chiminea, which would look more like a temporary piece of furniture, could be used.

Commissioner Bond expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler about the fireplace suggestion.

Commissioner Wheeler also suggested moving the shade structure off axis from the historic building; one way to do this would be to put it in the corner of the site, along 22nd Street, thus opening up the view to the historic building and providing more dining space; the fence wall could become built-in seating as part of the shade structure.

Commissioner Bond expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler about the movable chiminea-style fireplace suggestion. Commissioner Bond suggested that it could be a metal pipe about three feet in diameter with an arched cutout on one side for the fireplace, and potentially on wheels so that it can change position.

Commissioner Morgan expressed agreement with other Commissioners' comments about the structure, and with Commissioner Wheeler about the truss system seeming somewhat out of character.

Commissioner Morgan pointed out that there is an existing concrete knee-wall on the site which is a historic feature, and that the Commission generally asks applicants to retain such features. Commissioner Morgan suggested that any new fencing or seating incorporate that existing wall. Commissioner Morgan stated that it appears that glass or other transparent material is planned for the canopy roof material, which would be helpful for maintaining the subordinate appearance of the canopy structure, as recommended by Commissioners. Commissioner Morgan stated that usually the recommendation is that roof material of an addition correspond to the original building's material, but this is a unique situation and opportunity, being the replacement of a long-term temporary feature, the existing tent, with a permanent structure.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the rear addition is fine as submitted, as well as the covering over the window, which looks compatible and differentiated.

Commissioner Pearson stated that he liked the proposed fireplace and the siting as an homage to the prior location of gas pumps, though it may be a bit too large. Commissioner Pearson stated that the awning is problematic as submitted because it would be a shame to obscure the features of the unusual historic Mediterranean-style gas station.

Commissioner Danese stated that he also is opposed to the heaviness of the canopy, and suggested that steel instead of wood might be a solution, as this would allow the structure to be more minimal and have fewer supports, possibly even somewhat imitating the style of modern gas stations and the steel structures that they typically use over the pumps. Commissioner Danese suggested the possibility of moving the fireplace to the middle of the canopy area, to provide warmth more evenly.

Commissioner Butler Rodriguez expressed agreement with Commissioner Wheeler's suggestions to move the canopy structure to the side and to use a chimenea for the fireplace. Commissioner Rodriguez expressed agreement with Commissioner Danese regarding a lighter-looking steel structure, or perhaps a glass and metal structure for the canopy and also suggested that rather than one large fireplace there could be three smaller chimineas. Commissioner Rodriguez stated that the proposed canopy does block the existing historic building too much.

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

**The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity.**

8. [COA-081540-2020](#) 618 N. 21st Street - Construct a new single-family detached residence on a vacant lot.

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

[Base Map](#)

[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Ms. Jones.

The project architect, Mr. Ryan Patterson, stated that the applicants can work with all the staff comments. Mr. Patterson stated that the proposed mix of materials was a response to the adjacent brick buildings, and that the Cedar Street elevation was in response to adjacent frame structures and their siding. Mr. Patterson stated that the resulting hybrid was intentional, and that he had not seen a historic Sanborn map so that information was new to him, but that the applicants could move forward with a more consistent approach, making the house a frame structure with siding on each side.

Regarding the bay and the front door, Mr. Patterson stated that he had intended the porch to be a single bay porch and that the porch is actually contained to the first bay but the overhang extends into the second bay, in order to cover the staircase. Mr. Patterson stated that this design was intended to mimic the property at the other end of the lot, which has a similar configuration. Mr. Patterson conceded that the front door being at an angle is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Patterson stated that if the front door is relocated to the front façade, that would require expanding the bay of the porch into the second bay, which relates to the staff comment about making the house a three-bay residence.

Mr. Patterson stated that HVAC location information will be detailed in the next

application, and that it will most likely be in the rear of the house, possibly either adjacent to or under the deck.

Mr. Patterson stated that another issue not yet addressed was the potential for parking on the site, noting that currently there is no curb cut, and stated that he was uncertain if this is a possibility, and if it is within the purview of the Commission of Architectural Review.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there was any public comment. There was none. Ms. Jones stated that one public comment letter had been received, and one concerned phone message which Ms. Jones would follow up on.

Commissioner Bond stated that the entry as submitted is interesting and could be workable, and that the angle on the first floor makes for an interesting porch. Commissioner Bond stated that the porch does not have to go all the way across. Commissioner Bond stated that the proportion and scale of the proposed structure fits in nicely, but that some of the detailing should be more reflective of the fact that this is a new structure.

Commissioner Bond stated that an entirely different material, such as stucco, could be used for this new building, but that whatever it is, it should be consistent throughout the exterior of the structure.

Commissioner Wheeler expressed agreement that the side entry could work, and be interesting as a way to address the corner in a modern aesthetic. Commissioner Wheeler suggested possibly eliminating one the column on the left side of the porch and cantilever so that it reads almost as two masses. Commissioner Wheeler stated that another option, if masonry is used for the façade, would be to express the sill and the header more so as to enrich the façade.

Commissioner Wheeler stated that if masonry is used, when it wraps around the corner it should go back not an arbitrary amount such as 3 feet but in a way that reads as making sense, such as going as far as the windows. Commissioner Wheeler stated that mixing materials is acceptable as long as it is within a modern aesthetic, and that it looks as if a fiber cement panel without trim is proposed, which would already constitute a modern aesthetic. Commissioner Wheeler stated that the proposed siting seems acceptable, or the applicant could use the historic siting as per the Sanborn map.

Commissioner Morgan stated that the application was well-presented and that the applicants did a good job making the design reflect historic features from the district. Commissioner Morgan stated that the north and south elevations should taper to the rear, as they generally do in the district, and that this might help to lighten up those elevations and make them less blocky. Commissioner Morgan stated that she found the corner treatment well done.

Commissioner Klaus expressed agreement with previous comments, but expressed concern about the north elevation and its door location and asymmetrical windows. Commissioner Klaus stated that the north elevation on Cedar Street is a prominent one, and that the door gives the elevation increased prominence but the rest of the façade looks like an unexciting side elevation. Commissioner Klaus stated that the rear façade will also be prominent, and that that façade has an irregular window arrangement which should be made more regular. Commissioner Klaus stated that the strength of the design does not carry over from the front to the side and the rear elevations.

Commission Chair Johnson expressed agreement with Commissioner Klaus about the roof line going around the corner, or doing something else more creative there.

Commissioner Morgan stated, regarding parking, that the CAR would review that and that the Commissioners would most likely recommend the parking be off the alley. Commissioner Klaus pointed out that additional approval would be required. Ms. Jones pointed out that there is an adjacent lot on which new construction has been recently approved, so this might create a challenge for adding parking to the rear.

Commissioner Rodriguez expressed agreement with Commissioner Klaus regarding the north elevation, that it needs to be more interesting; and with Commissioner Wheeler regarding the left-hand porch post looking odd, and the recommendation of using a cantilever design, and having something closer in toward the door side. Commissioner Rodriguez stated that the sideways door positioning does not bother her and that the setback of the third bay is interesting. Commissioner Rodriguez stated that she liked the way it curves at the front.

**The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity.**

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:41 PM.