

Ms. Marianne Pitts
Commission of Architectural Review City of Richmond
Department of Planning & Development Review
900 East Broad St – Room 511
Richmond, VA 23219

Re: 101 N 29th Street rehabilitation & addition
Case # 018772-2017

Dear Ms. Pitts:

We have lived in our home for over 30 years at 111 N 29th St and have reviewed the above case and are against the request for the following reasons:

1. The height of the addition will have a negative impact on the historical architecture of our neighborhood. The architecture and materials are not in keeping with the existing structure and the neighborhood.
2. The garage as proposed on the alley seems to be unusable to access. There is a telephone pole at Franklin Street that makes it very difficult to use the entrance from the alley.
3. The Subject property is at the corner of E Franklin & 29th Streets and is a signature property to our neighborhood. Enclosing the porches will not be keeping with the historical nature of the neighborhood and other existing structures.

For these and other reasons too numerous to mention we ask that you deny this proposal as presented.

Sincerely,




Eric & Barbara Anderson

111 N 29th Street

Commission of Architectural Review
Attn: Marianne Pitts

CASE # COA-018772-2017

101 N 29th Street

6-23-2017

We are the adjacent-attached owners of the subject property. We have lived at this residence for 29 years.

The applicant has yet to discuss these proposed changes as a courtesy. Although the current application is not as massive as the first – we are still in opposition to the proposal.

We will outline our issues as follows:

- 1 The materials include metal which is not in keeping with the historic features of the property and the rest of the neighborhood. This property is a gateway elevation to Church Hill from Franklin Street and should remain historic.
- 2 The brick wall along our property line is currently braced to prevent failure which would cause a sinkhole and much damage to my property. If approved would request engineered stamped PE, drawing to assure my property is stable.
- 3 The garage opens to the ally and to access would require trespasses on the property to the east. There is also a telephone pole in the way. Why not enter from Franklin Street? No materials shown for the garage door.
- 4 The improvements would increase storm water and water quality issues.
- 5 No location shown for HVAC equipment and trash/re-cycle containers.
- 6 The enclosing of the existing porches changes the historic nature of the dwelling and is a primary elevation.
- 7 The rear porches are not original to the house.
- 8 Underlying zoning requirements:
 - a. height 35' appears to comply
 - b. Rear 5' setback appears to comply
 - c. Side setback 3' not in compliance – improvements shown to property lines
 - d. Lot coverage shall not exceed fifty-five (55) percent of the area of the lot- clearly not in compliance.

Lot is 20' x 24' = 2480 sq feet

House is 20' x 83' = 1660 sq feet

55% of existing lot is 1364 sq feet

Existing improvements are 296 sq feet above the lot coverage allowed. This requirement alone does not permit any improvements.

Inclosing we do not believe that these proposals are in keeping with the intent of the St John's Old & Historic District therefore we are against the application as submitted.

Larry & Sandra Horton

From: epinewood@aol.com
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Subject: 101 N. 29th Street
Date: Thursday, June 22, 2017 6:22:28 PM

June 22, 2017

Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary
Commission of Architectural Review
City of Richmond
900 East Broad St., Room 510
Richmond, VA 23219

Re. 101 N. 29th St.

Dear Ms. Pitts,

We are the owners of 103 ½ N. 29th Street, two doors down from the property in question, 101 N. 29th Street. We have looked at the resubmitted plans and still feel that they are not at all appropriate for the St. John's Old and Historic District. The enclosure of the porches fronting on Franklin Street will totally change the look of this property and of that street and the materials are not appropriate for this historic district. The garage still stands out with a boxy design and the materials on the two decks as well as the enclosure of the side porch are not appropriate for this historic district. Thank you for your consideration.

Elmo G. Cross, Jr.

Anne Geddy Cross

Anne Geddy Cross
epinewood@aol.com

From: [Danielle Worthing](#)
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Cc: [Cyane Crump](#)
Subject: 101 N. 29th Street
Date: Thursday, June 22, 2017 2:51:03 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Ms. Pitts,

Good afternoon. I am writing in regards to 101 North 29th Street, COA-018772-2017, item #20 on the June 27, 2017 Commission of Architectural Review agenda.

This project was conceptually reviewed at the March 28, 2017 CAR meeting, at which time I spoke to provide comments and feedback. I am happy to see that progress has been made with the design. In particular, I appreciate the removal of the proposed rear glass addition and round window above the side entrance. However, I still have a number of concerns, including:

1. **Porch**- The existing porch should be retained. The guidelines state “do not remove or radically change entrances and porches important in defining the building’s overall historic character.” It is disingenuous to demolish it and rebuild an “enclosed porch” that struggles to read as such. Vertical trim does not effectively convey the former columns. The design lacks any horizontal elements that are part of the existing porch. This house and this corner are an important transition from Sugar Bottom and gateway into Church Hill. As Sugar Bottom continues to develop and become more popular, it is all the more important that visible historic fabric remain at this corner.
2. **Side entrance**- Similarly, the previously stated guideline applies to the side entrance. While the side entrance may not be original, it has certainly achieved significance in its own right and should be retained. We are particularly concerned about the demolition of historic parts of the building (such as the wood frame porch extension above the doorway on the second floor which does not appear in the drawings) and would like to see as much as possible of the building retained.
3. **Garage**- While two story garages are not uncommon in the neighborhood, this garage is nearly the same size as 2904 E. Franklin Street, just east of the alley. To note, R6 zoning requires a rear yard to be no less than 5 feet, and limits lot coverage to not exceed 55% of the property.
4. **Mechanical Equipment**- No plan for HVAC or trash has been provided in the drawings. We recognize that there is limited yard space, but the sidewalk is not a suitable location for trash bins.

Because this property is located on a prominent corner, along an active street, that also functions as a gateway to the historic Church Hill neighborhood, it merits extra care and attention when being reviewed.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,
Danielle Worthing



Danielle Worthing
Preservation Specialist

Historic Richmond

Building on history

4 East Main St., Suite 1C

Richmond, Virginia 23219

tel: 804.643.7407

fax: 804.788.4244

dworthing@historichrichmond.com

HistoricRichmond.com

Follow us on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [Instagram](#), and [YouTube](#).

Anita Garcia-Stein
109 N. 29th St.
Richmond, VA 23223

June 27, 2017

By e-mail: Marianne.Pitts@richmondgov.com
Commission of Architectural Review
Department of Planning and Development Review
City of Richmond, VA
Attention: Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary

101 North 29th Street

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have reviewed the plan that Ms. Jane Freund submitted for renovating and expanding the improvements at 101 North 29th Street. If a historic property is supposed to keep its original configuration, I believe the plan does not accomplish that requirement in several respects.

First, I think that filling in the 2 large porches entirely changes the size and look of the building. Second, I think that the garage further changes the look of the original house. I think that the garage size should be made to resemble that of the carriage house that once occupied the lot and that its entrance should face Franklin Street. Finally, if the current large open porches on the south side of the building are to be retained, additional porches on the rear of the property are redundant (and further change the original configuration).

Thank you for your attention.

Anita Garcia-Stein

From: [Thomas Layman](#)
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Subject: From Thomas Layman, 2822 East Franklin Street
Date: Sunday, June 25, 2017 9:24:07 PM

June 25, 2017

Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary
Commission of Architectural Review
City of Richmond
900 East Broad Street, Room 510
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Reference: 101 North 29th Street

Dear Ms. Pitts,

On March 27th, I sent you an email detailing why I was in opposition to the proposed plans at 101 North 29th Street. After looking at the revised plans, I am still against these plans. Yes, a few changes have been made, but the closing in of the balconies and the use of metal around the windows is not in character with my historic neighborhood. Recently, every property owner was sent a notice from CAR to get in touch if we are to make exterior changes. We do not want the standards to be weakened and have properties look half fake and half real.

Furthermore, the requested additions and changes to the house at this location, (North 29th Street and East Franklin Street) is an area where buses and trolleys pass by often. And this intersection to Sugar Bottom will be a future gateway to the Riverfront. The side and back of this property will stand out.

Historic Church Hill is becoming a foodie destination and new businesses are opening. Tourism is bringing in additional taxes and income. Our property values are going up. Let's respect our architectural values for our "old and historic" district.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Layman

Enclosed is my previous email:

Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary
Commission of Architectural Review
City of Richmond
900 East Broad Street, Room 510
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Reference: 101 North 29th Street

Dear Ms. Pitts,

I am the property owner of 2822 East Franklin Street. My the eastern side of my house is across from 101 North 29th Street.

Having examined the proposed plans, I am against it.

- This neighborhood, with its uniqueness and in keeping with CAR's restrictions for the history of St. John's Church Old and Historic District, makes this proposal totally out of character.

- East Franklin Street from North 29th Street to Sugar Bottom is destined to have more traffic to link up with the Riverfront. Visitors coming up the hill will see an addition that does not meet CAR's standards.

- The large brick box on the back is especially out of character. The use of metal and double-paned windows are not appropriate for our neighborhood.

- What happens to future developers who will come to CAR and say if this property at 101 N. 29th Street can do this, why can we add or build with the same look and materials?

- The garage opening is right on the narrow alley. It seems impossible for two cars to enter.

- Re-read the history of the efforts of Elizabeth Scott Bocock, Douglas Fleet and others to make this historic area what it is today. My neighbors and I are doing our part to keep Church Hill unique in our city. We have visitors from all over coming daily on trolleys and buses along 29th Street to "The View" of the James River.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Layman

From: [Marilyn Stroh](#)
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#)
Subject: Fw: 101 N 29th
Date: Monday, June 26, 2017 12:34:35 PM



Ms. Marianne G. Pitts
Commission of Architectural Review
Re:101 N 29th Street rehabilitation and addition

Dear Ms. Pitts,

I have reviewed the amended construction proposal for 101 N 29th Street and as a close neighbor I am again against these plans as presented.

When we purchase a property here in the Saint John's Old and Historic District, we are aware of and agree to follow the historic guide lines as it pertains to the outside of our structures. I knew this when I purchased my home in 2002. Surely the owner of 101 N 29th Street is aware of those guidelines since she has owned this property far longer. Property owners in the Saint John's Old and Historic District recently received notice reminding us

of CAR guidelines. And I would expect she got the same reminder notice.

Does this owner think these rules don't apply to her?

1. She is **not** maintaining the look of the original structure by proposing to enclose the side porches. (Visible from both East Franklin Street and 29th Street)
2. Using materials that are **not** CAR approved and **not** in keeping with the architectural design of structures built in this historic district in the 1800's. (Visible from East Franklin Street and 29th Street)
3. Adding substantial mass to the rear of the structure, **not** original to the property. (Visible from East Franklin Street, 29th Street and the city owned alley behind 29th Street.)

I am attaching 2 photos taken from my back yard. As you can see I enjoy a clear view of the sky. If these plans are approved that view, the light and the air would be blocked. Not just from my yard but for most of the East side of the 100 block of 29th Street.

If the rules are "No change should be visible from a public street or affect neighbors within 150 feet", these plans, as presented must be denied.

Marilyn Stroh
107 North 29th Street
M_Stroh@msn.com
804-648-2109

19 N. 29th St., Unit C
Richmond, Va. 23223

June 25, 2017

Marianne G. Pitts, Secretary
Commission of Architectural Review
City of Richmond
900 East Broad St., Room 510
Richmond, VA 23219

Re: 101 N. 29th Street, COA-018772-2017

Dear Ms. Pitts,

I am the owner of a condo at the southeast corner of 29th and E. Franklin St., directly across the street from the property in question, 101 N. 29th Street. Specifically, I own the unit on the second floor, so my windows are at the level of the second-floor porch fronting E. Franklin at 101 N. 29th St. The revised plans are a significant improvement in the design, and I want to express my support for them. I still have some concerns:

- I agree with the Commission that the side porches should remain; however, if they are enclosed the material must be of the highest quality—either wood or a composite that emulates wood—and painted white, or “alabaster”. The porches are the most significant feature of the existing structure, visible as one approaches the corner from the east or the south. Therefore, the windows should match the painted wood trim and panels, rather

than the opaque and glass panels specified in the applicant's plans.

- I urge the adoption of the rear porch alternative that expands across the width of the building and is similar to the rear porch on the attached home, with boxed columns and wood rail to match the adjacent home.
- The garage addition is still too massive. It does not meet the Historic Guidelines of being as “inconspicuous as possible.” If the openings fronted on Franklin Street, the structure would look less boxy. This would also solve the problem of a location for the trash receptacles and mechanical equipment.
- The upper-level of the garage addition would be softened if windows were added on the Franklin Street side.
- The horizontal steel cable railing surrounding the roof terrace (above the garage addition) is jarringly different from the rest of the design. Vertical slats would be more visually compatible with the proposed upper rear porch.

Thank you for your attention and consideration,

Carol S. Wharton

cwharton@richmond.edu

From: [Amanda Walker](#)
To: [Pitts, Marianne G. - PDR](#); shorton103@hotmail.com
Subject: Proposed rehabilitation and expansion of 101 N. 29th Street, Case #2017-048
Date: Monday, June 26, 2017 3:36:24 PM

RE: Proposed rehabilitation and expansion of 101 N. 29th Street, Case #2017-048

Dear Ms. Pitts:

The proposed work at 101 N. 29th Street still does not fit into this historic neighborhood for a number of very significant reasons, and it is incongruous for the CAR to approve the design(s) as proposed. I elaborate below:

- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The proposal includes enclosure of the open, two-story porch facing Franklin Street where it is a defining feature of this prominent corner house as one enters the Old & Historic District; this proposal is in contradiction to City Design Guidelines;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->There are two proposed designs for rear porches at the property, one of which is completely inappropriate in terms of materials and design, and the other of more appropriate materials, has little if any evidence that it existed previously. A clearer proposal must be defined before approval is sought so that the CAR can effectively make determination on what is actually proposed;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The two-story garage requires more details as well in terms of elevation, materials, and dimensions. There are not enough details to know what approval is actually sought;
- <!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The proposed addition and enclosure are PERMANENT, and will set the standard for future work on this structure and offer a precedent for work on other properties. CAR must be very careful in approving work at such a visible and prominent property.

As I stated in my previous letter, as a resident of the neighborhood for over 25 years and the renovator of a home in the historic district, I sincerely believe that these structures benefit from periodic, thoughtful, appropriate updating that allows them to be loved and lived in over the long haul. In this way, they are not lost to the landfill or redevelopment. Even though we may own our properties, we are stewards. As stewards, we buy into the concept of historical preservation when we make a purchase. The CAR is an aid (and an enforcer) in this preservation.

I urge you to reject this design. Surely there are useful and appropriate renovation and addition plans that respect the historical character and precedents in the neighborhood.

Sincerely yours,

Amanda C. Walker