

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
April 24, 2018, Meeting**

15. COA-033494-2018 (E. Pou)

**3629 East Broad Street
Chimborazo Park Old and Historic District**

Project Description: Construct 2 new, 3-story single family dwellings.

Staff Contact: M. Pitts

Proposal: The applicant requests conceptual review and comment for the construction of a new single-family house on vacant lot at the end of East Broad Street. The lot is proposed to be created by splitting a larger lot on which a double house currently sits. The subject portion of the lot appears, based on the Sanborn maps, to have been not previously developed as the grade drops off dramatically to the east and south. The proposed frame structure will be two stories at the front and, due to the changes in grade, will be three stories at the rear which is not visible from the public right of way as there is no alley at the rear. The structure has a 4-bay facade and a full façade front porch with fiberglass Doric columns, a standing seam metal shed-roof, and Richmond rail. The façade has a bracketed cornice and shed roof. The dwellings will have 6/1, vinyl clad windows and cementitious siding. The applicant is proposing to locate parking at the front of the structure to be accessed by an existing curb cut.

Surrounding Context: The proposed new construction will be located with no frontage on East Broad Street. Immediately to the north of the subject lot is City-owned public right of way which is currently a wooded area. The structure to the west on the same lot is a 2-story brick double house with a false mansard roof. Directly across the street, on the north side of Broad is a large, modern apartment development. The majority of the houses on this dead end block of Broad Street are frame with a mixture of shed and false mansard roofs. There is a recently completed dwelling at 3607 and another under construction at 3625.

Previous Reviews: This is the Commission's first review of this project.

The applicant is seeking **Conceptual Review** for this project. Conceptual review is covered under Sec. 30-930.6(d) of the City Code: The commission shall review and discuss the proposal with the applicant and make any necessary recommendations. Such Conceptual Review shall be advisory only. Commission staff reviewed the project through the lens of the "Standards for New Construction: Residential" on pages 46-51 of the *Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*.

S=satisfies

D=does not satisfy

NA=not applicable

S **D** **NA**

New infill construction should respect the prevailing front and side yard setback patterns in the surrounding district

The front yard setback is shown as 15' and the side yard setbacks are shown to be 8'. The front yard setback is consistent with that of the adjacent home though staff has concerns with parking being located in the front yard setback as this is not a form found in the district. The proposed side yard setback appears to be consistent with that of the adjacent property.

Where the adjoining buildings have different setbacks, the setback for the new building should be based on the historical pattern for the block

The historical pattern for the block is consistent with the front yard setback pattern of the adjacent structure. On the subject side of East Broad Street, the side yard setbacks vary.



3629 East Broad Street (1925 Sanborn Map)

New buildings should face the most prominent street bordering the site

There is proposed lot does not have street frontage. The structure addresses the extension of the East Broad Street right of way with an entry door in the bay closest to the street.

New construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the district. Form refers to the combination of massing, size, symmetry, proportions, projections and roof shapes that lend identity to a building.

The project utilizes elements found on structures on the block including a full façade porch, and a 4-bay, symmetrical façade. The majority of the houses on the block have decorative cornices and shed roofs or false mansard roofs. Staff has concerns that the

distance between the top of the 2nd story windows and the cornice is not be consistent with the proportions found in the historic structures on the block with similar roof lines. The Commission may want to consider encouraging the applicant to include a false mansard roof.

The proposed parking at the front of the structure is not a building form found in the district. Staff supports the applicant's request to use the existing curb cut, but recommends parking be limited to the side or rear of the structure as is found with the other curb cuts on the block.

New construction should incorporate human-scale elements such as cornices, porches and front steps.

The proposed project incorporates human-scale elements including a front porch and front steps. Staff has concerns that the proposed structure attempts to use design elements inspired by varying styles of architecture. For this reason, staff recommends simplified porch columns rather than the proposed doric columns.

New construction should respect the typical height of surrounding buildings

Though the applicant did not provide a dimensioned context elevation, the typical height of the historic structures on the subject block is two stories. Staff anticipates the height will be compatible with the historic structures.

New construction should respect the typical width, organization of bays, vertical alignment and symmetry of surrounding buildings.

The proposed dwelling is similar in width to the adjacent double houses and maintains the 4-bay configuration, vertical alignment, and symmetry of the surrounding buildings.

The size, proportion, and spacing patterns of doors and window openings should be compatible with patterns established in the district.

The typical fenestration pattern in the district includes evenly spaced ranked windows. The proposed façade fenestration is consistent with patterns in the district. Staff has concerns that the proposed 6/1 lite configuration is not a lite configuration appropriate for an Italianate inspired home. The vertical alignment and consistent window sizes are not maintained on the secondary elevation. Staff recommends the fenestration be modified on the highly visible west elevation to include consistent window sizes and lite configurations.

Porch and cornice heights should be compatible with adjacent buildings

A context elevation was not provided.

Materials used in new construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the district. Vinyl, asphalt, and aluminum siding are not permitted.

The proposed frame construction is consistent with new structures in the District. The Commission does not typically approve vinyl windows, and therefore staff requests details of the window material be submitted for review.

The following items will need to be included for final review (please refer to the Commission's New Construction Checklist and Required Dimensions document for additional details):

1. Dimensioned elevations to include the window head and sill heights.
2. Dimensioned context elevation
3. List of windows and doors to include size, material, and design
4. Description of all materials (attach specification sheets if necessary)
5. Statement of how the *Richmond Old and Historic District Handbook and Design Review Guidelines* informed the proposed work.