



Staff Report  
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

6. COA-128343-2023	<b>Final Review</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Meeting Date: 4/25/2023</b></span>
<b>Applicant/Petitioner</b>	Will Gillette / Baker Development Resources
<b>Project Description</b>	Construct a new two-story single-family detached dwelling.
<b>Project Location</b>	
<b>Address: 907 N 24<sup>th</sup> Street</b>	
<b>Historic District: Union Hill</b>	
<p><b>High-Level Details:</b></p> <p>The applicant proposes to construct a new two-story single-family detached dwelling.</p> <p>The dwelling will be traditional in design and will feature a front bay window, a front cross gabled roof, and a single-story, full-width, covered front porch.</p> <p>There will be a rear deck as well as a rear, gravel parking area.</p>	
<b>Staff Recommendation</b>	<b>Approval, with Conditions</b>
<b>Staff Contact</b>	Alex Dandridge, 804-646-6569, alex.dandridge@rva.gov
<b>Previous Reviews</b>	The Commission reviewed this application at the March 28, 2023 meeting. The Commission expressed concern over the height of the proposed building and believed that it wasn't compatible with the block context. The Commission also advised that the proposed building design incorporate architectural elements commonly found on the subject block.
<b>Staff Recommendations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A site map with labeled setbacks be submitted for administrative review and approval, and that the building's setback generally align with the two neighboring buildings to the north and the south.</li> <li>• A dimensioned context drawing be submitted for administrative review that labels the height of the proposed building and the neighboring buildings.</li> <li>• Final window specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval.</li> <li>• Final materials selections be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval including the dimensions and color of the proposed faux slate.</li> <li>• Any new retaining wall, steps, or curbing on the site associated with the new construction be labeled on a final site plan and that the material be compatible with the district as listed in the <i>Guidelines</i>.</li> </ul>

## Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
Standards for New Construction, pg. 46	3. <i>New buildings should face the most prominent street bordering the site</i>	The building will face the most prominent street, N. 24 <sup>th</sup> Street.
Standards for New Construction, Siting, pg. 46, #2-3	2. <i>New residential infill construction should respect the prevailing front and side yard setback patterns of the surrounding block. The minimum setbacks evident in most districts reinforce the traditional street wall.</i>	<p>Based on the submitted information, proposed setbacks are not clearly identified. <u>Staff recommends that a site map with labeled setbacks be submitted for administrative review and approval, and that the building's setback generally align with the two neighboring buildings to the north and the south.</u></p> <p>In the R-63 zoning districts, front yards are not required, however a front yard shall be no more than 15' deep. Side yards no less than 3' in width.</p>
Standards for New Construction, Form, pg. 46, #1-3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>New construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the historic district.</i></li> <li>2. <i>New residential construction should maintain the existing human scale of nearby historic residential construction in the district</i></li> <li>3. <i>New residential construction and additions should incorporate human-scale elements such as cornices, porches and front steps into their design.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The building will be rectangular in form and have a cross gabled roof and a bay window on the front façade. The second story bay window will have a pediment above it which will be clad in shingles. The front façade is a traditional design that is pulling architectural elements and massing from the Queen Anne style. A majority of the dwellings on the subject block are simplified examples of Italianate and Greek Revival styles which are earlier styles than Queen Anne.</p> <p>The Italianate style was common in the United States from 1845-1885 and the Queen Anne Style was common from about 1880-1910.</p> <p>While the neighboring dwellings are early examples of Italianate, and this block was not historically developed in the Queen Anne Style, the design of the proposed dwelling could have overlapped historically.</p> <p>There are some examples of the Queen Anne style in other parts of Union Hill.</p> <p>A one-story, single-bay, covered front porch will be provided per the Commission's request during the conceptual review. The dwellings on either side of the subject parcel have full-width front porches. Staff finds the full-width front porch to be in-keeping the subject block.</p>

<p><b>Standards for New Construction, Height, Width, Proportion, &amp; Massing, pg. 47, #1-3</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>New residential construction should respect the typical height of surrounding residential buildings.</i></li> <li>2. <i>New residential construction should respect the vertical orientation typical of other residential properties in the surrounding historic districts.</i></li> <li>3. <i>The cornice height should be compatible with that of adjacent historic buildings.</i></li> </ol>	<p>During the conceptual review the Commission expressed over the height of the originally proposed building which was 36' in height. The new proposed building will be 8' shorter at 28'. Staff supports this decrease in height.</p> <p>The cornice height appears to align with the neighboring dwellings.</p> <p><u>Staff recommends that a dimensioned context drawing be submitted for administrative review that labels the height of the proposed building and the neighboring buildings.</u></p>
<p><b>Standards for New Construction New Construction, Doors and Windows, pg.49 #3</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. <i>The size, proportion, and spacing patterns of doors and window openings on free standing, new construction should be compatible with patterns established in the district.</i></li> </ol>	<p><u>Staff recommends that final window specifications be submitted for administrative review and approval.</u></p>
<p><b>Standards for New Construction, Materials &amp; Colors, pg. 53, #2, #5</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <i>Materials used in new construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the surrounding neighborhood.</i></li> <li>5. <i>Rooftop mechanical equipment should be located as discretely as possible to limit visibility. In addition, appropriate screening should be provided to conceal equipment from view. When rooftop railings are required for seating areas or for safe access to mechanical equipment, the railings should be as unobtrusive as possible, in order to minimize their appearance and visual impact on the surrounding district.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The dwelling will be clad in horizontal siding, have a parged foundation, and faux slate cross gable and front porch roof. Horizontal siding is compatible with the district; however, there are not many examples of visible slate roofs in Union Hill or on the subject block. There are examples of visible slate roofs closer to Jefferson Park, but not on the subject block which was developed much earlier. <u>Staff recommends that final materials selections be submitted to staff for administrative review and approval including the dimensions and color of the proposed faux slate.</u></p> <p>HVAC equipment is proposed to be located adjacent to the south side elevation of the building. Staff believes it will be minimally visible from the ROW.</p>
<p><b>Standards for Site Improvements, pg. 76</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. <i>Brick or granite pavers are the most appropriate choice in most Old and Historic Districts.</i></li> <li>5. <i>Existing granite curbing should be retained whenever possible.</i></li> <li>6. <i>Sidewalk design should allow for the installation of appropriate urban landscaping.</i></li> </ol>	<p>There is concrete curb and steps bordering the sidewalk on the property, both which are in poor condition. During the conceptual review, <u>Staff recommended that any new retaining wall, steps, or curbing on the site associated with the new construction be labeled on a final site plan and that the material be compatible with the district as listed in the Guidelines.</u></p> <p>The applicant did not provide these details.</p>

	<p>7. Sidewalks and curbs should be built of common building materials found throughout the District. Generally, simple paving designs are more compatible with the diverse building styles and better unify the various elements found on streets throughout Old and Historic Districts. The use of more than two paving materials within an area is discouraged.</p>	<p>A rear gravel parking area is being proposed. Gravel is a compatible material for rear parking areas as noted in the <i>Administrative Approval Guidelines</i>.</p>
--	--	--

## Figures

Figure 1. Subject block looking south.



Figure 2. Across 24<sup>th</sup> Street from subject parcel.



Figure 3. New construction across 24<sup>th</sup> Street from 907 N. 24<sup>th</sup> Street.



Figure 5. 907 N. 24<sup>th</sup> Street, vacant lot. Front retaining wall in poor condition



. Figure 6. Original dwelling on-site. Demolished

