




Staff Report
City of Richmond, Virginia



Commission of Architectural Review

8. COA-107853-2022	Final Review	Meeting Date: 3/22/2022
Applicant/Petitioner	Amanda Seibert	
Project Description	Construct a new single family, two story detached house on a vacant lot.	
Project Location		
Address: 967 Pink St.		
Historic District: Union Hill		
High-Level Details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant proposes to construct a two-story, single-family detached residence on a vacant lot. The new residence will be contemporary in design with a front facing gable and projecting bay Front roofs will be standing seam metal while the rear roof will be architectural shingles Siding will be Hardie Board and Batten as well as Hardie Smooth siding between the front and rear windows and wood siding at the front porch. 		
Staff Recommendation		
Staff Contact	Alex Dandridge, alex.dandridge@rva.gov , (804) 646-6569	
Previous Reviews	<p>This application was conceptually reviewed at the November 23, 2021 meeting. The Commission provided comments to the applicant. The Commission expressed some support of the vertical siding being proposed on the front façade of the building due to the overall contemporary design. The Commission also recommended increasing the prominence of the front gable as well as breaking up the side elevations so they do not appear as elongated.</p> <p>In response to the Commission’s comments, the dwelling now features two open sides on the second-floor balcony to allow more light and visibility into the space and dwelling, and also creates a more engaging feature on the northern elevation which faces the triangular intersection of Pink and Carrington Streets. The design also now features horizontal siding towards the rear of both the right and left elevations of the dwelling to replace the previously proposed board and batten</p>	

	siding throughout each elevation. Finally, the board and batten siding on the rear elevation has been replaced with more traditional horizontal siding to match the elevations and provide compatibility with nearby dwellings.
Staff Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The front facing gable have a more substantial cornice feature with a greater reveal than the proposed trim piece. • Horizontal siding be utilized on the front façade in place of the proposed vertical siding. • Final exterior materials be submitted to staff for review and approval. • Final window and door schedule be submitted to staff for review and approval.

Staff Analysis

Guideline Reference	Reference Text	Analysis
Siting, pg. 46	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>	The proposed dwelling will be set back 10' 8" which is consistent with dwellings in this area. Staff notes there are varying setbacks in this district.
Form, pg. 46, #1-3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>New construction should use a building form compatible with that found elsewhere in the historic district.</i> 2. <i>New residential construction should maintain the existing human scale of nearby historic residential construction in the district</i> 3. <i>New residential construction and additions should incorporate human-scale elements such as cornices, porches and front steps into their design.</i> 	<p>While the new construction is narrower and deeper than any remaining historic dwellings in the immediate area, Staff finds that the subject property is located in an area at the northern edge of the Union Hill Old and Historic District which has very little historic fabric left to serve as context for new construction.</p> <p>The front façade will incorporate architectural elements appropriate for City Old and Historic Districts such as a front porch and stairs, a single projecting bay with a front facing gable roof, and a visible standing seam metal main roof.</p> <p>Staff finds that given the transitional nature of this block, being near the edge of the district, the proposed new construction is compatible featuring elements associated with not only the few existing historic dwellings, but also the existing and proposed new construction on the block.</p> <p>The proposed front facing gable is typical of homes with projecting bays in the district. It has a staggered concrete walkway and a recessed covered front entry which is unusual in this district.</p> <p>As submitted, the front facing gable features a horizontal trim piece that separates the face of the gable from the body of the building. During the conceptual review of this application, the Commission recommended that this trim piece be more substantial with a greater reveal. <u>Staff recommends that that the front facing gable have a more substantial cornice feature with a greater reveal than the proposed trim piece.</u></p>

<p>Height, Width, Proportion, & Massing, pg. 47, #1-3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>New residential construction should respect the typical height of surrounding residential buildings.</i> 2. <i>New residential construction should respect the vertical orientation typical of other residential properties in the surrounding historic districts.</i> 3. <i>The cornice height should be compatible with that of adjacent historic buildings.</i> 	<p>The new construction will be two-stories which generally respects the height of the district, and the other existing and proposed new construction on the subject block.</p> <p>The new construction will respect the vertical orientation of other residential properties in the surrounding district, as well as the existing and proposed new construction on the subject block.</p> <p>The cornice height is proposed to align with that of the proposed adjacent new construction located at 967 Pink Street.</p>
<p>New Construction, Doors and Windows, pg.49 #3</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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> 	<p>Applicant is proposing paired windows that are vertically aligned on the front façade.</p>
<p>New Construction, Corner Properties, pg. 48, #5</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <i>For residential corner properties, we strongly encourage the use of architectural elements that are typical of residential corner properties in Richmond's historic districts: porches that turn from primary to secondary elevations, corner towers, projecting bay windows, side entrances (including porticos, and shed roofs, where appropriate), side porches, lighting related to that on the primary elevation, and other similar treatments that treat the secondary corner elevation as an architecturally important elevation.</i> 	<p>In response to the Staff and Commission feedback, the applicant has opened the northern wall on the side of the second story front porch to add additional openings to the north elevation and greater transparency and light to the second story front porch component. Staff recommends approval of this new configuration on the north elevation.</p>
<p>New Construction, Materials & Colors, pg. 53, #2, #5</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Materials used in new construction should be visually compatible with original materials used throughout the surrounding neighborhood.</i> 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> 	<p>The materials proposed are compatible with the district, with the exception of the architectural shingles being proposed on the rear section of the building. Staff recommends approval of this material, as this will be a new build, and the shingles portion of the roof will likely be minimally visible from the main street.</p> <p>The applicant has addressed the Commission and Staff comments from the conceptual review by removing the vertical siding from the rear of the building, however retained the vertical siding on the front façade.</p> <p>While vertical siding has been approved previously on contemporary new construction, staff finds the overall form of the building to be traditional, and believes a horizontal siding would be more appropriate for the dwelling. <u>Staff recommends that horizontal siding be utilized on the front façade in place of the proposed vertical siding.</u></p> <p>Staff notes that the contemporary design could be reinforced by the solid paneling between the windows on the front facade, the front porch configuration, or utilizing vertical</p>

siding only within the face of the gable, such as the cladding design on the rear elevation. The HVAC unit is proposed to be located in the rear and will not be visible.

Figures



Figure 1. 1924-1925 Sanborn Map



Figure 2.



Figure 3. View north on Pink St.



Figure 4. View south Pink St.



Figure 5. 967 Pink St.



Figure 6. New construction across the street