

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
STAFF REPORT
April 28, 2014 Meeting**

6. **CAR No. 15-045** (S. & S. Tuttle)

**615 North 25th Street
Church Hill North Old and Historic District**

Project Description:

**Enclose rear porch and
construct two new outbuildings**

Staff Contact:

M. Pitts

The applicant requests approval to modify an existing partially enclosed rear porch and to add two new outbuildings at the rear of this residential property located in the Church Hill North Old and Historic District. The existing structure is a freestanding frame Greek Revival home built in 1853 which has been heavily altered prior to the creation of the Church Hill North Old and Historic District.

Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.

Porch Enclosure. The *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines* state that porch enclosures are only appropriate on secondary elevations (pg. 67, #12). The proposed porch infill is located on the secondary, rear elevation and is minimally visible from 29th Street. Additionally, the visibility of the proposed work from the alley at the rear of the property will be lessened with the construction of the proposed outbuildings.

The *Guidelines* also state that “solid materials are not recommended for use in enclosure projects since they can radically alter the historic appearance of a porch” (pg. 67, #13). Historically, there was a two story porch at the rear of the structure. The majority of the first floor porch has been enclosed, and the second floor porch is partially enclosed as part of previous renovations on the structure. Little acknowledgement of the existence of the historic porches was included in these porch enclosures. The applicant is proposing to modify this altered façade to more appropriately reference the previous porches and to incorporate more windows. The applicant proposes to reference elements of the existing porch by installing pilasters with the profile to match the existing remaining columns and installing vertically oriented 4/4 HardiTrim boards with beveled corners to create vertical shadows on the bottom third of each story and topped with 5/4 HardieTrim to resemble a porch railing. Though the sides of the infill will include a smooth HardiePanel on the upper portion of each floor and will not include windows, the proposed rear elevation of the enclosure includes six new double hung 6/6 windows and a new 6 lite double door with a transom. The inclusion of these glass elements is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Staff recommends that the windows be true divided lite or simulated divided lite.

Outbuilding, Studio. The *Guidelines* for the construction of new residential outbuildings include that the outbuilding “should be smaller than the main

residence and be located to the rear and/or side of the property to emphasize that they are secondary structures” and that it “should be compatible with the design of the primary building on the site, including roof slop and materials selection” (pg. 48). The applicant is proposing to construct a 1 ½ story artist studio at the rear and side of the property, immediately behind the primary structure. This structure will be subordinate to the 2-story main structure. The applicant proposes to incorporate several elements which will reference the primary structure without duplicating these elements as to not create a false sense of historicism. The proposed roof will be a snap lock standing seam metal roof with 1” ribs to match the roof of the existing structure on the primary building and is designed with a gable to match the side gable of the existing house. The proposed windows on the most visible southwest elevation and the northwest elevation will be 6/6 double hung windows to match the windows on the primary structure. The applicant notes that the windows are grouped in three where possible to differentiate the studio from the historic structure. The siding is proposed to be the same material and color as the primary structure but will use a 5” reveal rather than a 7” reveal to reference and not duplicate the siding from the historic structure. The applicant also proposes low slope metal dormers over an 18 lite door surrounded by two stationary 18 lite doors all topped with 3 lite transoms on the southwest elevation and a metal shed roof on the one story projection off of the north west façade. The proposed windows on the elevations closest to neighboring properties include three 6 lite windows on the northeast elevation and one 6 lite window on the southeast elevation which are proportionate to the top sash of the double hung windows. As with the window additions to the primary structure, staff recommends that the windows be true divided lite or simulated divided lite. Staff recommends approval of the proposed studio as the applicant carefully designed this structure to be subordinate and compatible in design and material to the historic structure without creating a false sense of historicism by purposefully handling the materials in a way that distinguishes the new construction from the historic house.

Outbuilding, Garage/Storage. The proposed garage/storage outbuilding is subordinate to the historic structure and the proposed studio as it is a simple one story structure in the rear of the property. The proposed roof slope will match that of the primary structure and the proposed 5V metal roof material will reference the metal roof of the main structure. Like the proposed studio, the garage will have a masonry base and 5” reveal siding in the same paint scheme. The proposed 6 lite windows will be proportionate with the top sash of the double hung windows in the historic structure and the proposed studio. Staff recommends that these windows should also be true divided lite or simulated divided lite. The design of the proposed overhead paneled garage door and the doors on the northwest elevation are consistent with the design of carriage style doors in the district. As with the studio, the garage/storage outbuilding has been designed to conform to the *Guidelines* as the structure is subordinate to the other structures on the property and compatible with these other structures and existing outbuildings in the neighborhood.

It is the assessment of staff that the application, with the condition that all windows are to be true divided lite or simulated divided lite, is consistent with Richmond City Code Section 114-930.7 (b) Standards for Rehabilitation and Richmond City Code Section 114-930.7 (c) Standards for New Construction as well as with the *Richmond Old and Historic Districts Handbook and Design Review Guidelines*, specifically the pages cited above, adopted by the Commission for review of Certificates of Appropriateness under the same section of the code.