

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
STAFF REPORT  
October 25, 2016 Meeting**

13. **CAR No. 16-155** (J. Farrar)

**2107 Cedar Street  
Union Hill Old and Historic District**

**Project Description:** **Rehabilitate an existing home to include new windows, doors, siding, and roof; removal of the existing single story addition; and construction of a two story addition and deck at the rear.**

**Staff Contact:** **M. Pitts**

The applicant requests approval to rehabilitate and construct an addition to a Greek Revival frame structure constructed ca. 1861 in the Union Hill Old and Historic District.

The existing dwelling is a two-story, three-bay, frame structure with a low-sloped, side-gable, metal roof. There is a single-story extension at the rear with a shed roof, and a single-story, projecting bay at the northeast corner. The existing structure has been altered over the years to include the installation of fiber cement siding, a new front door, and vinyl windows. The applicant proposes to reinstall fiber cement siding as the current siding was installed incorrectly. The applicant proposes to replace the vinyl windows, on the façade, with 2/2, simulated-divided-lite, wood windows with a vinyl coating. The applicant proposes to construct a two-story addition at the rear of the structure. The existing roof which will remain a metal gable roof. The shed roof of the proposed addition will be clad in white TPO and tie into the existing gable roof. The portion of the proposed addition located above the existing single-story portion of the structure will be setback 6" from the existing building wall on the west elevation. The two-story portion of the addition will be setback 2 feet from the existing building wall on the west elevation. The applicant proposes to install 1/1 wood windows with a vinyl coating on the addition and construct a two-story covered porch set on brick piers at the rear. The chimney will be removed on the interior of the building and above the roof but the applicant proposes to reconstruct the portion of the chimney visible from the exterior into the roof of the new addition.

This proposal was conceptually reviewed by the Commission at the July 26, 2016 meeting. The Commission had the following concerns regarding the project:

- The projecting bay at the front of the structure should be maintained, not demolished as proposed.
- The windows should not be PVC windows.
- The metal gable roof should be maintained and not replaced with asphalt shingles.
- The historic chimney should be maintained and not demolished.
- The addition should be differentiated from the existing structure.

**Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions.** Staff believes the proposed rehabilitation and new construction is consistent with the Commission's *Guidelines*. The applicant has responded to the concerns of the Commission by no longer proposing to demolish the projecting bay, use PVC windows, or replace the metal roof with asphalt shingles. The applicant is proposing to use a wood window with a vinyl coating, and staff recommends the applicant provide additional information regarding the proposed windows to allow staff to determine if these windows model effectively the appearance of historic windows as recommended by the *Guidelines* (pg. 65, #10). Staff recommends the new windows should be true or simulated-divided-lite.

Though the *Guidelines* note that additions should not obscure or destroy original architectural elements (pg. 45, Materials and Colors #1), staff has concerns regarding the manner in which the applicant is recreating the original chimney. As the new chimney will no longer be located in the historic roof, staff does not feel it is appropriate to rebuild a faux chimney in the roof of the new addition that will not extend into the interior. Staff recommends the non-functioning new chimney not be built.

The *Guidelines* state that new work including additions should be differentiated from the old (pg. 5, #9). The applicant is proposing to differentiate the addition by setting the addition back from the existing building wall. Additionally, the applicant proposes to utilize 1/1 windows in the new addition compared to the 2/2 windows in the existing structure. Staff believes the applicant has effectively differentiated the new construction from the existing building. The *Guidelines* note that materials used in new residential construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the district (pg. 45, Materials & Colors #2). As traditionally the roofs in the district are dark in color, staff recommends the proposed primary and porch roofs be clad in black or gray membrane, not the white.

It is the assessment of staff that the application, with the noted conditions, is consistent with the Standards for Rehabilitation and New Construction outlined in Section 30.930.7(b) and (c) of the City Code, 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 code.