



# City of Richmond

City Hall  
900 East Broad Street

## Meeting Minutes Commission of Architectural Review

---

Tuesday, December 21, 2021

3:30 PM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

---

**This meeting will be held through electronic participation means.**

[PDRPRES  
2021.184](#)

Public access and participation instructions-Commission of Architectural Review

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

### Call to Order

The meeting began at 3:31pm.

Eva Campbell read the announcement for virtual public meetings.

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

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

Commission Chair Johnson explained that the meeting's first half hour is for business matters, which may not be of interest to the general public, though they are welcome to attend.

### Roll Call

**Present --** 7 - \* Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., \* Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, \* Commissioner Mitch Danese, \* Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, \* Commissioner Andrew Moore, \* Commissioner Sean Wheeler and \* Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**Excused --** 1 - \* Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

### Approval of Minutes

None.

### Secretary's Report

Ms. Campbell spoke about the newest CAR member, John Grier, who wasn't able to make today's meeting but is sworn in. His position is the citizen-at-large position.

She asked what the Commissioners want to speak about for the January quarterly meeting. She also said that meetings will continue virtually until told otherwise.

### Administrative Approval Report

There were no questions or comments.

## Enforcement Report

Ms. Campbell said that Staff has been issuing NOV's and property owners have already begun to be in correspondence.

Mr. Dandridge reported that 2609 W. Grace has been in contact with staff and there will be an Administrative Approval coming soon.

## OTHER BUSINESS

### Consent Agenda

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

Eva Campbell 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, which are items earmarked for the staff recommendations to be approved by Commission without formal review, 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, or to request that their items from the consent agenda.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the Commissioners wished to move any items from the regular agenda to the consent agenda. No one responded.

## REGULAR AGENDA

1. [COA-103317-2021](#) 620 Chamberlayne Ave-Construct two new attached double houses.

Attachments: [Application and plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Alex Dandridge.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there were any question for staff from Commissioners. There were none.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the applicant was present. The applicant, Forrest Frazier, responded yes. His responses to the staff comments were as follows: vertical course of recessed brick is a detail of interest, and wasn't done historically; a quarter of the porches in the vicinity are half-width porches; he was amenable to changing to one front façade material; he's open to suggestions to improve the secondary elevations; and he accepts the 1-over-1 windows.

Commissioner Wheeler asked about the proposed material for the recessed entryway. Mr. Frazier said it was cementitious (hardie) but could be brick.

Commission Chair Johnson opened the floor for public comment.

David Henderson, owner of an adjacent property, asked the architect about the height of

the 3rd floor.

Mr. Frazier spoke to the R-63 zoning, which allows 3-story buildings. The buildings are proposed to be taller than those buildings in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. Henderson said the recessed third floor makes the project stick out in the historic district.

Commission Chair Johnson opened floor for Commission discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to defer the application provided the following conditions are met: the vertical course of recessed brick be removed from each of the brick facades; the attached units be differentiated with elements that are more commonly found on attached row houses in the district; each unit utilize a full width, single story, covered front porch; only one material be used on the front façade to create a more visually uniform massing; incorporate elements and treatments that are more architecturally significant on the secondary elevations; windows be 1/1 or casement window; final window and door schedule should be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the HVAC equipment be screened.

Commissioner Wheeler said they should discuss how to treat the corner; they could push the windows further forward towards the street, for instance. He doesn't think turning the porch would be sufficient.

Commissioner Moore said that the applicant has done a good job to address comments made during the Conceptual Review, especially the cornice and front entrances. He said that overall, it still lacks a certain finesse and detail that is a character-defining element of a historic district. He said that the applicant should look at 413-415 N. Arthur Ashe Blvd. as an example of a contemporary townhouse that includes historic features. He said he cannot vote for this – he would want this to be deferred.

Commissioner Brewer said it's come a long way, but she believes that redesigning elements will be too much for staff to review. She would also like to see larger porches.

Commissioner Morgan said that she agrees with Commissioner Moore's comments but she believes it is compatible with the historic district. She agrees with Commissioner Wheeler on the side elevation, that perhaps the windows could be pushed forward or there could be a second window. She agrees with staff recommendations about having 1-over-1 or casement windows. She said CAR has seen this application quite a few times and she doesn't want to see the Commission have to redesign a project they've seen a lot.

Commissioner Butler-Rodriguez said she agrees on the porch detail and the side façade. She said that the south side could be enhanced somehow; perhaps one of the facades is pushed forward. She doesn't think the part that sticks out goes well with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Wheeler said there are quite a few leaps that staff will have to do, so he would be open to deferring the application. He said he didn't pick up on the double window on the front façade – which might not be appropriate. He chose to withdraw his motion, and Commissioner Brewer agreed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to defer the application to address elements cited in the first motion and the comments made during discussion.

Commissioner Moore said that there are ample examples of rows of rowhouses in the neighborhood to get a sense of the amount of detail needed to make the front façade not so monolithic.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Wheeler, seconded by Commissioner Brewer, to defer the application to address elements cited in the first motion and the comments made during discussion.**

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

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

2. [COA-103051-2021](#) 2311 Venable-Rebuild a previously removed covered front porch.

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Alyson Oliver.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there were any question for staff from Commissioners.

Commissioner Moore asked about the roof material – is it typically the staff recommendation for TPO/membrane roof to be acceptable? Ms. Oliver said yes, it is typical. He also asked how they determined the priority levels as stated on the staff conditions. He said there's ambiguity on what's actually required. He asked what they're obligating the applicant to do. Ms. Oliver said that the obligation would be to replace the turned posts and railing to match the original in design, and while it would be preferable to also replace the decorative spindle work at this time, staff would be ok with that coming back at a later date and being an administrative approval as long as the spindle work matches the original elements in design.

Commission Chair Johnson said that there was a financial component to the staff comments.

Commissioner Moore asked how they would approach the cornice detail, with the fascia board and eave. Ms. Oliver said that staff found the spindle posts was what made the porch unique, and staff was comfortable with whatever roof they propose and adding in those features later. She also said the adjacent porches have been changed over time.

Commissioner Moore said he would like to a built-in gutter to match the original design instead of a flat piece of trim.

Commission Chair Johnson said that pre-fabricated items that could come close to the original porch design.

Commissioner Butler-Rodriguez asked about the replacement of windows mentioned in the application.

Ms. Campbell said that won't be addressed in this application.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the applicant was present. The applicant, Sharron Smith, responded yes. She said she's lived in this neighborhood her entire life; however, the 2300 Venable block only has 3 houses with the original porch details. She said that the subject property has changed a lot over time. She wants to be able to afford to build the new porch. She said her house is in desperate need for a porch, it's very unsafe. Commissioner Moore asked if the drawing in the application is her intention to build. Ms. Smith responded yes.

Commission Chair Johnson opened the floor for public comment.

Commission Chair Johnson opened floor for Commission discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Moore, seconded by Commissioner Butler-Rodriguez, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the reconstructed front porch match the original design as closely as possible. The details to be retained have been ranked by priority below. If it is not feasible to make all of the repairs at this time, the lower priority elements may be added in the future as resources become available. Final drawings and material specifications should be submitted to staff for review and administrative approval; High priority: repair and retain the existing turned posts that are attached to the front façade; Incorporate turned post columns matching the existing turned posts into the porch design. Lower priority: Incorporate architectural details matching the original front porch, including spindle work frieze and sawn brackets, if submitted at a later date, approval to be completed administratively; Richmond rail design used for new porch balustrade; the new TPO roofing be a dark color, submitted to staff for review and approval; New porch roof have built in gutters resembling the original.

Commissioner Moore asked what staff wants to modify; Ms. Oliver said just changing the columns. He wants to make sure they don't put an additional burden on the applicant.

Commissioner Wheeler said they could stipulate a built-in gutter, as opposed to one attached to the fascia.

Commissioner Moore said he didn't think it would work. Commissioner Moore and Butler-Rodriguez said they'd be okay adding this as an amendment.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Moore, seconded by Commissioner Butler-Rodriguez, to approve the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the reconstructed front porch match the original design as closely as possible. The details to be retained have been ranked by priority below. If it is not feasible to make all of the repairs at this time, the lower priority elements may be added in the future as resources become available. Final drawings and material specifications should be submitted to staff for review and administrative approval; High priority: repair and retain the existing turned posts that are attached to the front façade; Incorporate turned post columns matching the existing turned posts into the porch design. Lower priority: Incorporate architectural details matching the original front porch, including spindle work frieze and sawn brackets, if submitted at a later date, approval to be completed administratively; Richmond rail design used for new porch balustrade; the new TPO roofing be a dark color, submitted to staff for review and approval; New porch roof have built in gutters resembling the original.**

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

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

3. [COA-103364-2021](#) 2318 Venable-Rehabilitate an existing residence; reconstruct a front porch and construct a new rear addition

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Alex Dandridge.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there were any question for staff from Commissioners.

Commission Chair Johnson said this may be better to be deferred.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if the applicant was present. The applicant, Chris Maka, responded yes. He said that nothing really has changed in the plans that were approved previously except for the setback.

Commissioner Butler-Rodriguez asked if the front still has several layers of paint. Mr. Maka said yes, they intend to power wash it down to the original brick.

Commission Chair Johnson opened the floor for public comment. There was none.

Commission Chair Johnson opened floor for Commission discussion.

A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Moore, to approve approved the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the existing cornice be repaired and repainted, and paint colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; approval of the front porch reconstruction, with the condition that the design match historic photographs, to include brick piers and turned posts; final front door specifications be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the basement-level door be replaced with a solid wood four-panel door, to match the existing design, specification submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; that new and replacement windows match the historic light configuration and have true or simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar between the glass; window specifications submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; that the rear doors be vertically aligned; that the windows on the rear façade be consistent in height; that the applicant update the building plans to reflect the existing conditions of the property and the extent of the new rear addition prior to applying for a building permit; plans to be submitted to staff for administrative approval; that the porch roofs be a dark TPO membrane or flat lock metal; materials submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the lintels and sills not be repainted and any paint color for the brick be submitted for administrative approval; approval of the demolition of the rear of the building and the construction of a new rear addition; updated demolition plan be incorporated into the plans prior to applying for a building permit; if paint is removed a test strip must be done to assure no brick is damaged in the process.

Commissioner Moore said that in this case, even though there's a long list of conditions, they are very straightforward and are objective – as opposed to the deferral earlier on the agenda.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Morgan, seconded by Commissioner Moore, to approve approved the application for the reasons cited in the staff report provided the following conditions are met: the existing cornice be repaired and repainted, and paint colors be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; approval of the front porch reconstruction, with the condition that the design match historic photographs, to include brick piers and turned posts; final front door specifications be submitted to staff for administrative approval; the basement-level door be replaced with a solid wood four-panel door, to match the existing design, specification submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; that new and replacement windows match the historic light configuration and have true or simulated divided lights with interior and exterior muntins and a spacer bar between the glass; window specifications submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; that the rear doors be vertically aligned; that the windows on the rear façade be consistent in height; that the applicant update the building plans to reflect the existing conditions of the property and the extent of the new rear addition prior to applying for a building permit; plans to be submitted to staff for administrative approval; that the porch roofs be a dark TPO membrane or flat lock metal; materials submitted to staff for administrative review and approval; the lintels and sills not be repainted and any paint color for the brick be submitted for administrative approval; approval of the demolition of the rear of the building and the construction of a new rear addition; updated demolition plan be incorporated into the plans prior to applying for a building permit; if paint is removed a test strip must be done to assure no brick is damaged in the process.**

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

**Aye --** 7 - Commissioner Neville C. Johnson Jr., Commissioner Ashleigh N. Brewer, Commissioner Mitch Danese, Commissioner Coleen Bulter Rodriguez, Commissioner Andrew Moore, Commissioner Sean Wheeler and Commissioner Kathleen Morgan

**Excused --** 1 - Commissioner Lawrence Pearson

## **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

4. [COA-103044-2021](#) 207 W Franklin-Construct a new rear addition.

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Alex Dandridge.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there were any question for staff from Commissioners.

Commissioner Brewer recused herself from this application.

The applicant, Dave Johannas, identified himself. He said that he has no information on

the DHR easement. He said that they can focus on concept 2. There are numerous examples of outbuildings that are the whole width of the lot, and are 2 stories.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if Commissioners had any questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Moore said he wasn't sure what was going on in the rear dependency. Mr. Johannas said they want to put the addition to the east of the existing building.

Commissioner Butler-Rodriguez asked what the material is between them. Mr. Johannas said it may be a pane of glass, but there probably won't be much visibility.

Commissioner Moore said he appreciates adding density to the area and that there's latitude since it's in the alley. He thinks option 2 is more appropriate because it probably wouldn't be appropriate to demolish any part of the house. He thinks the building form of the carriage house approach is appropriate. He said to reconsider the floating end of the building. Commissioner Moore said masonry would be the best material.

Commissioner Wheeler said to be careful about faux garage doors to the alley – they would need to be articulated better. He said there will be egress issues too. He said that the dormers and the façade could use some work/articulation.

Commissioner Morgan said she prefers option 2. She added they could add some architectural features or coursing on the side elevations.

Commission Chair Johnson said the carriage house is the way to go.

**The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.**

5. [COA-103042-2021](#) 413-415 Arthur Ashe Boulevard-Construct two new attached, 3- story single family residences.

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Eva Campbell.

Commission Chair Johnson asked if there were any question for staff from Commissioners.

The applicants, Josh Bosler and Greg Shron, identified themselves. They said they met with staff this morning, and they spoke about several other portions of Arthur Ashe – including between Floyd and Ellwood – that could have more of a direction for the project. Mr. Shron said that there are a few different massing strategies that they could potentially use, including pulling forward the recessed 3rd floor or using dormers.

Commissioner Moore said that this is an example of a contemporary project with an admirable amount of detail without being a replication of historic forms. He said that The Fan has a huge variety of building types, but the forms are all really compatible. He wasn't sure about recessing the 3rd floor, and thinks it should be brought forward. He doesn't agree with staff comments about a mansard. He encouraged the applicants to take away the planters, which might collect beer cans and cigarettes.



Commissioner Butler-Rodriguez said that they should add porches; the more people out front, the better.

Commission Chair Johnson echoed their comments about bringing forward the 3rd floor and adding front porches.

Commissioner Wheeler reiterated the front porch idea and instead of mansard, creating a covered porch on the 3rd floor. He said there should be more focus on the windows. The windows above the doors don't seem to be the right width; they should be widened. The windows on the side seem out of place and should be enlarged to be a similar height. On the back, there are un-aligned windows that should be aligned.

Charles Aquino, the owner of 417 N. Arthur Ashe, spoke for public comment. He said he's in favor of the project and appreciates the Commissioner's comments.

**The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.**

6. [COA-103036-2021](#) 612 N 27th St-Remove a non-original addition and construct a new rear, two-story addition and shed.

**Attachments:** [Application & Plans](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

The application was presented by Eva Campbell.

The applicant, Linnea Gerwing, identified herself as the owner. The architect, Kevin Jones, identified himself. They wanted to respond to the side hall of the house – the asymmetric roof is a response to the historic asymmetric roof. He also mentioned that the Church Hill Association gave the project their support.

Commission Chair Johnson opened the floor for public comment. There was none.

Commissioner Wheeler said this is a refreshing application for a Conceptual Review. He said it's pretty successful. The only comments he has is about the siding – they wouldn't want the horizontal siding to exactly match the existing siding and also reiterated that it should not have a faux wood grain. He also proposes looking at the shingle style.

Commissioner Moore said this was the most developed conceptual plan ever. His one comment was with the abstraction and continuation the building form. The thing that bothered him was the roof slope – he suggested continuing the historic form by pulling it over to the original roof line and breaking the slope and maintain the historic massing with the roof line.

Commissioner Morgan said that this was really detailed and she appreciated it. She said she thinks this project is cool.

Commissioner Brewer said she wanted to echo the comments about the siding being a different scale.

**The application was conceptually reviewed. The Commission discussed the proposal with the applicant and made recommendations in an advisory capacity. A record of the comments will be made available to the applicant upon the approval of the meeting minutes.**

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00pm.