

**COMMISSION OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW  
STAFF REPORT  
February 28, 2017 Meeting**

16. **CAR No. 17-015** (C. Mullaney)

**533 Mosby Street  
Union Hill Old and Historic District**

**Project Description:** Construct a new single family dwelling and a garage.

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

The applicant requests approval to construct a small, two-story, single family dwelling on a narrow vacant lot in the Union Hill Old and Historic District.

The residential character of the east side of the subject block consists of 2 to 2 ½ story structures in a mix of Greek Revival, Italianate and Late Victorian architectural styles and structures constructed in the 1990s. The majority of the structures on the odd side of the block including the non-historic structures are frame, 3-bay structures with full façade porches. Mosby Street represents the boundary of the Union Hill Old and Historic District, and the parcels on the west side of Mosby Street are not within the District. These parcels have been developed with multifamily housing that have undulating elevations, are 3 to 4 stories in height, and are clad with fiber cement panels, metal panels, and brick.

The Commission reviewed this project conceptually on December 13, 2016 and for final review on January 24, 2017 and in general were supportive of the contemporary design. The Commission deferred the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to revise the plans to provide a detailed context elevation to include porch, window and door locations; details of the proposed parking area; locations for the exterior mechanical equipment, trash, and recycling receptacles; and an alternate paint color for the siding as the Commission acknowledged black is not a siding color found in the District. In response to the Commission's concerns, the applicant provided the following information:

- A context elevation which includes windows, doors, and cornices. Per the context elevation, the applicant is proposing to align the porch floor with the structure to the north.
- The applicant noted the parking area will be at the rear and will be gravel, and the trash receptacles will be kept in the parking area.
- The proposed mechanical equipment will be on the north slope of the roof.
- The applicant proposed a dark brown grey color for the siding which is similar to Black Fox on the Commission's palette.

**Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted with the noted conditions.** Staff believes the proposed new construction is consistent with the Commission's *Guidelines*. Though the proposed design does not mimic the historic architecture of the district, staff believes the applicant has successfully

modified the design to be “a good neighbor” to the historic structures as is recommended by the *Guidelines* (pg. 44). The structure is at the same height of the nearest buildings and a similar setback. The applicant has modified the roof form to include a roof form that is found on primary structures in the district. The applicant has proposed an alternate siding color which is similar to a dark color found on the Commission’s palette as a siding color for Georgian, Federal, and Greek Revival style structures. As it is a siding color on the palette, staff recommends approval of the proposed color. Staff has concerns that the proposed rooftop HVAC equipment may be visible from the alley or Cedar Street. Staff recommends the HVAC equipment be located in the rear yard or the applicant confirm the equipment will not be visible from the public right of way prior to the installation of the exterior mechanical equipment.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed garage as the structure conforms the Commission’s *Guidelines* for Outbuildings (pg. 48) as it is at the rear of the property, is small, uses a roofline consistent with outbuildings in the district, and uses materials found in the primary structure.

It is the assessment of staff that the application, with the noted conditions, is consistent with the Standards for New Construction outlined in Section 30.930.7(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.